

JUL 21 1915

Modern Philology

VOLUME XIII

July 1915

NUMBER 3

DANTE'S "SECOND LOVE"

In the story of the *Vita Nuova*, Beatrice's death left Dante morally and physically prostrated. His friend Cino da Pistoia remonstrated. Such suicidal grief, sinfully rebellious, must debar him forever from the "blessed joy which her name signified."¹ Let Dante therefore cease to rebel against God's will; let him take comfort in hope.

Strip thee of these habiliments of woe,
As very Reason doth importune thee:
Of grief men die, yielding them to despair.
How then might'st see again the visage fair
If thee, thus desperate, death overtake?
Prithee, for God's sake,
Cast off this heavy burden from thy heart;
Lest it a traitor's part
Play to thy soul, which hopeth on God's stair
To see her welcome thee with arms outspread.
With that hope please thee to be comforted.²

Dante was pleased to be comforted, but—with another lady. Later, disillusioned and remorseful, he came to find peace in Cino's way.

¹ "La beata gioia come chiamava il nome." Canzone—*Asegna ch'io non aggio più per tempo*. Ed. A. J. Butler, *Forerunners of Dante*, Oxford, 1910, p. 136. Cf. *Vita Nuova*, II, 6-8.

² *Ibid.*, II, 46-53.

Spogliatevi di questa veste grama,
Da che voi siete per ragion richiesto:
Chè l'omo per dolor muore e dispera.
Come vedrete poi la bella ciera
Se v'accogliesse morte in disperanza?
Da sì grove pesanza
Traete il vostro core omai, per Dio;
Che non sia così rio
Ver l'anima vostra, che ancora ispera
Vederla in cielo, star nelle sue braccia;
Dunque di speme confortarvi piaccia.

It is not an unfamiliar story. There is also something not unfamiliar in Dante's insistence that the other lady was "gentle, beautiful, young, and sage,"¹ that indeed she first attracted by reminding him of his old love,² so that in the new were "vestiges of the antique flame." It is but human to plead extenuating circumstances. The reader smiles, and—with Beatrice—forgives.

But many readers find it hard to forgive Dante's calm assertion in the *Convivio* that by this other lady, his "second love," he only meant Philosophy. If, as he says,³ "not passion but virtue" had really moved him to sing of her, why have called his desire of her "culpable"?⁴ Why have shed bitter tears for shame of it? If the *Donna Pietosa* was just Philosophy, how have denounced her as an "adversary of reason,"⁵ and in the name of Virtue have renounced her? Not for being a pagan: the philosophy of the *Convivio* is orthodox Christian-Aristotelian. If common-sense suggests that he simply forgot his dead lady in study, the *Convivio* emphatically replies: "I believe, affirm, and am certain that I shall pass from this to another and better life, where that glorified Lady liveth, of whom was my soul enamored."⁶

Is Dante then just fooling us? Critics have said so—Signor Antonio Santi, for instance, recently.⁷ According to Santi, Dante is concerned to explain away not so much his "second love," namely, for the *Donna Pietosa*, as what we may term his third love, namely, for *la Pietra*, so called. In fact, however, the *Convivio*, as far as it goes, does nothing of the kind. It is the *Donna Pietosa*, not *la Pietra*, who is identified with Philosophy. How Dante, had he continued the *Convivio*, would have "moralized" the *canzoni* relating to *la Pietra* is matter of conjecture; but Santi's allegation of disingenuous trickery on Dante's part in leaving the *Convivio* unfinished is gratuitous. The symbolic logic of the *Convivio*, as it stands, provides for *la Pietra* in a way verified, as I shall attempt to show, by the argument of the *Commedia*. Meanwhile, let us consider the prior issue of the Second Love, or *Donna Pietosa*, as presented in the *Vita Nuova* and *Convivio*.

¹ *V.N.*, xxxix, 5-6.

² *Conv.*, I, II.

³ *Ibid.*, xl, 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xxxvii, 1-6.

⁵ *V.N.*, xl, 14-15.

⁶ *Conv.*, II, ix, 132-36.

⁷ "Il ravvedimento di Dante e l'inganno del *Convivio*," *Giornale dantesco*, July-August, September-October, 1914.

In both works, certain poems, purporting to record actual experience, are brought together and interpreted from the vantage-ground of retrospect. The interpreter views the recorded experience as a whole, knows its outcome of spiritual regeneration—"new life" sustained by Wisdom. And now he would share his crumbs from the "banquet" of that "food of Angels." Every happening on the way to this fortunate outcome now looks providential, however dubious at first.

There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will.

For Dante, Love was that divinity. Obedient to Love's inspiration, often enigmatic, he had come by successive trial and failure to a final success, the test of which was inward peace; as the proof of previous failure had been inward unrest. His service of the *Donne dello Schermo* in Beatrice's lifetime, and of the *Donna Pietosa* after Beatrice's death had indeed been at noble Love's bidding, and so of virtuous intent; yet of the insufficiency of these loves each ensuing "battle of thoughts" had been proof. Service of Beatrice on earth or in heaven had alone brought peace. And peace, stilling of desire, is the one and final object of all desire.¹

So subtly, but truly, in the retrospect he can declare Beatrice from first to last the one real object of his desire.

I mind me not
That ever I estranged myself from thee,
Nor have I therefore conscience that doth prick.²

Before this declaration, to be sure, he has drunken of Lethe; but Lethe washes away, not the deed, but the sin in the deed. Blindfold, he had all along been groping for her in whom his desire might be stilled. If in his infirmity he had grasped at others in the way, they had been but mistaken identities,

false images of good
The which no promise can fulfil entire.³

Now his eyes are unbandaged. He knows his true lady. Detaining him from her, these other loves had been "culpable"; yet in fact Providence had brought him by way of them to her; and for Providence, the end justifies the means. He had been weak; but Beatrice

¹ Cf. *Epist.*, X, 472-74.

² *Purg.*, xxxiii, 91-93.

³ *Ibid.*, xxx, 131-32.

might say, as God to Paul: "Sufficit tibi gratia mea: nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur."

Now if by grace his very infirmity had been seed of good, why might not the voice of his infirmity, his song of false love, show inspired intimation of his predestined true love? So he looks, and finds there oracular ambiguities, coincidences big with fate. That "salute di Beatrice," his first blessedness shows also as his last; for *salute* means "salvation" as well as "salutation"; and the root of the name "Beatrice" is that of "Beatitude," the Christian's reward. And truly "nomina sunt consequentia rerum";¹ for as the root of her attendant Nine is Three, so must Beatrice herself be rooted in the Trinity. Singing of the Lady Joan preceding Beatrice, had he not unwittingly implied that other John who had preceded the "True Light"? Had he not reason also, like St. Paul, to "glory in an abundance of visions" to guide him?

Is Dante serious? Well, if we are to go on calling him a mystic, we should remember that the word means something—meant more yet in the thirteenth century. Dante certainly believed that Virgil had unwittingly announced the Messiah, and had come—unhappily too late for his own profit—to know it.² If Virgil in his song might build better than he knew, why not Dante? And why not to Dante the more blessed grace of realizing in time his own at first unapprehended inspiration, of playing the Daniel to his own Nebuchadnezzar's dream?

But even if prophecy were "read into" his songs by Dante for literary effect, the things prophesied were real for him. The *Donna Pietosa* became for him Philosophy, because through her he achieved Philosophy. Consider the situation.

Beatrice was in heaven; Dante disconsolate with life; the accepted consolation of the *Donna Pietosa* reconciled him with life—saved him from the sin of moral and perhaps physical suicide which Cino warned him against, and led him back to his appointed duty, fulfilling which he might earn that merit through which, grace given, salvation was to be won and Beatrice's salutation in heaven. So by the inscrutable decree of Providence the rival of Beatrice is transformed into her ally.

¹ *V.N.*, xiii, 20-21.

² *Purg.*, xxii, 67-69.

Now to be with Beatrice in heaven would be to share her blessedness, communion with God.¹ That "blessed joy, which," as Cino had said, "her name signified," is in effect the joy of the blest.² Beatrice in glory, "la viva Beatrice beata," becomes then no arbitrary, but a *real*, symbol of heavenly blessedness. Attaining her means attaining that, just as for Catholics partaking of the consecrated bread and wine means partaking of Christ.

Similarly, as the *Donna Pietosa* was the providential agency which called Dante from rebellion against God back into the path of obedience which leads to earthly blessedness, so she becomes a real symbol of that earthly blessedness. Desire of her fatefully involved desire of that.

Again, if Beatrice so is heavenly blessedness—not as a mere figure of speech, but as a real symbol—her guidance is one with the guidance of theology—revelation as interpreted by the pope. As she herself says:

Ye have the Old and the New Testament,
Also the Shepherd of the Church to guide:
Let this suffice you unto your salvation.³

So, if the *Donna Pietosa* is, symbolically, earthly blessedness, her guidance is one with the guidance of philosophy—reason as interpreted by Aristotle. "Because," says Dante,⁴ "all human activities require a single end, namely, the end of human life for which man is ordained so far as he is man, the master and artificer who shows us this end and devotes himself to it ought to be most of all obeyed and trusted; and this master is Aristotle . . . [his] school [of moral philosophy] at the present day holds the sceptre of the world in teaching everywhere, and their doctrine may almost be called 'Catholic opinion.' Thus it may be seen that Aristotle was the guide and conductor of the world to this goal"—earthly blessedness.

Thus by her fruits known and symbolized, the *Donna Pietosa* signifies Moral Philosophy, and her sphere of influence is the active life presided over by philosopher and emperor, as Beatrice, signifying Theology, has for her sphere of influence the contemplative life presided over by Scripture and pope.

¹ Cf. *V.N.*, xliii, 15-17.

² Cf. *Purg.*, xxxi, 22-24.

³ *Par.*, v, 76-78.

⁴ *Cons.*, IV, vi, 63 ff. (transl. of W. W. Jackson).

To call this interpretation a deception is to mistake Dante's purpose. *Vita Nuova* and *Convivio* are not personal memoirs like the *Confessions* of Rousseau, but edifying confessions like St. Augustine's, like parts of St. Paul's Epistles. The common theme is redemption by grace of divine love. That for Dante divine love shone through the eyes of two women, "gentle" and "gentlest," may have been the fact. It may have happened so. The same love spoke to Paul through a great light, to St. Augustine in a mysterious voice.¹

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.

Dante is talking about the effects of his loves on himself. Edification of others is his excuse. And so, for speaking of himself, he pleads the precise precedent of Augustine, who "in the *Confessions* . . . by the progress of his life, which was from bad to good, and from good to better, and from better to best, . . . gave example and instruction. . . ."² The three stages of progress, moreover, are precisely Dante's, (1) to the good of the Christianly active life, (2) to the better of the Christianly contemplative life, (3) to the best of the perfect life to come.

Let me now briefly trace this argument in the *Convivio* itself.

Beatrice is dead. "The source of edification"³ for Dante has been suddenly dried up. He is left forlorn—like the apostles, Christ being risen. Fitly therefore had his vision of her passing savored of the Crucifixion.⁴ He knows indeed, without Cino's reminder, that his redeemer liveth, and his orphaned soul yearns to her. "I was, and am certain," he declares,⁵ "by her gracious revelation that she was in heaven. Therefore many a time, pondering on her as deeply as I might, I went thither as though rapt." Indeed, such was the sweetness of this thought, "that it made me long for death, to go thither where it went."

But such impatience is subject to Cino's admonition. Against it, as rebellious to God's will, a spirit of love from Venus incites. The angelic Intelligences are not urging unfaith to Beatrice, but on the

¹ *Confessiones*, VIII, xii.

² *Cons.*, I, ii, 104-10.

³ la fontana
D'insegnamento, tua donna sovrana.
ANON.: Ben aggia l'amoroso e dolce core.

⁴ *V.N.*, xxiii.

⁵ *Cons.*, II, viii, 40-55.

contrary would exact the one thing presently needful for the final fulfilment of faith to her, by "indirections finding directions out." Humanly blind to that divine purpose, Dante hesitates, questions. Even as the angelic adviser in the *Vita Nuova*, Love "clad as a youth in whitest raiment," they in effect answer: "Ask not more than is expedient for thee."¹

The love to which the Intelligences incite is of earth, "the only region within their power."² Its reward lies within the "active or civil life."³ For as motor-Intelligences, they possess only the blessedness of the active life, and cannot confer a blessedness which they have not.

So in effect, they, agents of divine Providence, would correct Dante's *inordinate* desire of instant salvation by inspiring a love reconciling him with present duty. As they are the agents of God, the *Donna Pietosa* is their agent. Themselves, as Dante says,⁴ "natured by love of the Holy Spirit," send to him a comforter to his earthly task, as the Holy Spirit itself, the Comforter, was sent to the apostles for theirs. So Dante is brought to "the loving practice of wisdom," "l'amoroso uso della Sapienza," to the

Virtue which giveth man felicity
In his activity.⁵

So known by her fruits—"finis est principium omnium operabilium"⁶—his Second Love is fittingly hailed as "fairest and most noble daughter of the Emperor of the Universe . . . Philosophy."⁷ By the figure she would be younger sister of Beatrice. Later, as we shall see, Dante draws analogy between his two loves and the sisters Martha and Mary.

This symbolical sisterhood of the two loves is further indicated by the parallelism of the two *canzoni* of praise, first of the *Vita Nuova* and secondly of the *Convivio*. But the *Convivio* also draws clear distinction. To possess the "hope of the blest,"⁸ "la viva Beatrice beata," would be "for the human intellect," says Dante, "to find that full satisfaction, that perfect peace, which constitutes eternal blessedness. But such is for man only when he shall have become

¹ Cf. *V.N.*, xli. ² *Conv.*, II, ix, 30-48. ³ *Ibid.*, II, v, 66-80. ⁴ *Ibid.*, II, vi, 110.

⁵ *Virtute . . . che fa l'uom felice
In sua operazione* [*Conv. Cons.*, III, 83-84].

⁶ Aquinas, *Comm.*, II Cor., 12:3.

⁷ *Conv.*, II, xvi, 100-103.

⁸ *V.N.*, xix, 47.

as an angel in heaven."¹ The *Donna Pietosa*, on the other hand, offers indeed "pleasures of paradise," such that her lover finds satisfaction (*si contenta*), "but in other wise than contentment in Paradise, which is perpetual: and to man on earth such is not vouchsafed."² She represents perfection "up to the limit of capacity of the *human* essence."³ And Dante's capacity was for God's purposes in the activity of prophetic song.

Book III having declared the virtue of the Second Love, Book IV shows how that virtue, descending into the lover, may exalt him to likeness. Whatever degree of nobility, *gentilezza*, is latent, God-given, in him may be actualized. In the measure of his grace he may receive the freedom of Eden, human perfection.

There is a higher earthly blessedness, communion with Beatrice in thought, contemplation of heavenly blessedness. That, however, Dante must postpone until his mission is fulfilled, as St. Bonaventura in the zeal of his "great offices ever postponed the left-hand care" of mystic contemplation.⁴

Again, there is a highest blessedness, not earthly—communion face to face with the glorified Beatrice. For that Dante must be "transhumanized," either through the purgation of death, or—as in the *Commedia* he actually represents—by the miracle of rapture.

Such I take to be the dialectic of the *Convivio*. Toward the end of Book IV, the argument is summed up impersonally in two allegories. In the first,⁵ the Lord's judgment of Martha and Mary is declared to mean that the contemplative life is "best," although the active life is "good." In the second allegory, Marcia, by command of her first husband, Cato, leaves him for her second, Hortensius; then, her womanly task accomplished, asks as reward of her merit reacceptance by Cato. This means, says Dante, that the noble soul by God's will turns from contemplation of him to its earthly task, then, that accomplished, would return to its first loving contemplation. Substitute for Marcia Dante, for Cato Beatrice, Dante's First

¹ Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theolog.*, I-II, qu. III, a. 2: "Promittitur nobis a Deo beatitudo perfecta, quando erimus sicut angeli in coelo."

² *Cons.*, III, iv, 34-37.

³ *Ibid.*, III, vi, 85-87.

⁴ *Par.*, xii, 129. Cf. E. G. Gardner, *Dante and the Mystics*, London, 1913, pp. 255-56; but cf. *infra*, pp. 10, 14.

⁵ *Cons.*, IV, xvii, 85 ff.

Love, and for Hortensius the *Donna Pietosa*, Dante's Second Love, and the analogy is perfect.

There is also in Book IV a third allegory, which would show the Second Love, if not ordered to God, "culpable"—thus justifying the judgment at the close of the episode of the *Donna Pietosa* in the *Vita Nuova*. This allegory of the Angel at the Tomb¹ repeats the moral of the episode of the Pilgrims in *Vita Nuova*, xli, as later interpreted in *Paradiso*, xxxi, 103-11. The three Marys, or the three sects of the philosophy of the active life, vainly seek Christ, *la somma Beatitudine*, in the tomb of this world. The Angel, or "appetite of the soul" for Wisdom, food which satisfies but never sates,² directs the seekers to where alone that Highest Blessedness is to be found on earth, namely, in Galilee. For "Galilee," meaning "whiteness," "a color more charged with material light than any other," says Dante, may properly signify Contemplation.

For the Marys to have remained at the tomb after the Angel's enlightenment would have been culpable. The risen Christ was not there. So for the Christian to cleave to the active life as if highest blessedness were to be found in it would be equally culpable. The contrary has been revealed to him. He is erring, therefore, not in darkness—like the virtuous pagan Virgil—but against the light. Ignorance of God is only privation of good, the judgment of limbo. Defection from God is election of evil, meriting the judgment of hell. Dante was called into the active life of this world for God's purposes. His confessed error was for a time to be seduced by "things present with their false pleasure,"³ and to follow a worldly life, not for God's purposes, but for his own; or, symbolically speaking, to cleave to the *Donna Pietosa*, forgetting Beatrice. So Aquinas: "The perfection of man is that, despising things temporal, he cleave unto spiritual. . . . Imperfection is it to desire temporal goods, though ordered to God; but it is perversity to set in temporal goods the end."⁴

¹ *Conv.*, IV, xxi, 134 ff.

² *Cf. Par.*, II, 11-12:

. . . . pan degli angeli, del quale
Vivesi qui, ma non sen vien satollo.

³ *Purg.*, xxxi, 34-35.

⁴ "Perfectio autem hominis est ut contemptis temporalibus, spiritualibus inhaereat. . . . Imperfectorum autem est quod temporalia bona desiderant, in ordine tamen ad Deum: perversorum autem est quod in temporalibus bonis finem constituent."—*S.T.*, I-II, qu. xcix, a, 6. This allegory also interprets retrospectively the episode in the *Vita*

In the *Divina Commedia* this progressive allegory of the two Loves is only dramatically clarified. Moved by the divine Love expressed through Beatrice in glory, Virgil—or Moral Philosophy unilluminated by Faith¹—leads Dante up to the Earthly Paradise, freedom whereof is given by Matilda, opener of Dante's eyes to the faith by the pageant of the church. Matilda's reward, therefore, is earthly blessedness so far as attainable by Christian moral philosophy. She is the antitype of the Leah of Dante's dream,² who is explained as signifying "action." In other words, Matilda is simply the symbolic *Donna Pietosa*, given a "local habitation [in Eden] and a name."³

She leads him back to Beatrice, clothed in the symbolic attributes of the Christian contemplative life—the colors of the theological virtues and the crown of wisdom. She is thus the antitype of Rachel in the same dream.⁴ But though absolved from his guilt of alienation from Beatrice, Dante may not yet satisfy his thirst for contemplation of her. The Seven Virtues themselves forbid, just as before the angelical Intelligences had done. "Too absorbedly," they cry, and turn away his eyes.⁵ Beatrice herself explains why.⁶ Like the Disciples, like St. Paul, Dante must abide yet awhile in the active life of this world. He must prophesy to men the wrongs of church and empire, that these may be set right. He must call men to salvation by declaring his vision. That done, the reward of his service shall be contemplation of her. So him, through his attendant guides,

Nuova of the Donne dello Schermo—simulacra of true love from whom Dante is providentially recalled to that. In other words, his successive experiences progressively illustrate one spiritual lesson.

¹ Quivi [in limbo] sto io con quel che le tre sante
Virtù non si vestiro, e senza vizio
Conobber l'altre, e seguir tutte quante.

—*Purg.*, vi, 34–37.

² *Purg.*, xxvii, 94–108.

³ Dante sees Leah under the planet Venus (*Purg.* xxvii, 94 ff.) under the influence of which he had been moved to love the *Donna Pietosa*.

⁴ *Ibid.* The contention of some critics that Rachel's antitype is not Beatrice but St. Bernard is counter to Dante's custom of making his dreams in the *Purgatorio* symbolically anticipative of immediately following experience. Moreover, St. Bernard symbolizes passage from mediate to immediate vision of God. Dante is not competent for this until "transhumanized."

⁵ *Purg.*, xxxii, 1–9. If the "sinistra cura" of *Par.*, xii, 129, means "temporal care," the turning here of Dante's eyes "to the left hand" may appropriately signify his turning to the active life at the bidding of all the virtues. Cf. again *Par.* x, 55–63.

⁶ *Purg.*, xxxii, 100–105; xxxiii, 31 ff.; also *Par.*, xvii, 124–42.

the Seven Virtues, Beatrice comforts in the very words of Christ to his disciples:

Modicum, et non videbitis me,
Et iterum, sorelle mie dilette,
Modicum, et vos videbitis me.¹

In identifying the *Donna Pietosa* with Matilda, I do not mean to say that at the time of her appearance in the *Vita Nuova* or even in the *Convivio* she would have responded to that name. I do not know whether she would have or not. Her development as a symbolic character was, I repeat again, by retrospective process. She may in the first place have been a real woman loved by Dante after Beatrice's death, and made the theme of his occasional verse. The retrospective interpretation of the *Vita Nuova* then at once justifies his love of her as "noble," and yet condemns it as "culpable." Resolution of the apparent contradiction lies, I think, in the logic of the *Vita Nuova* itself, but—as the dramatic plan of that work demanded—the truth is shown enigmatically, "quasi in sogno."² Next, the *Convivio*, more clearly shows the benign effects of the *Donna Pietosa's* influence, namely, his attainment through her agency of an earthly activity in accord with Wisdom. But the *Convivio*, though it implies, yet slurs the resolution of the dramatic conflict between her and Beatrice. Finally, in the *Divina Commedia* all strands of the argument, both dramatic and symbolic, are smoothly interwoven, their tangles untwisted. The *Donna Pietosa* becomes a God-given Comforter to his appointed activity in the world, Philosophy, peace-bringer to the "battle of his thoughts," soothing his sense of exile from his true Blessedness, Beatrice, by the realization given that this exile is but temporary and a needful "way of sighs," on which God has sent him forth, yet by which, his mission done, he shall return to God. But, on the other hand, to desire the *Donna Pietosa* inordinately, to make her the too great delight of his eyes, as in the *Vita Nuova*³ he confesses to have done—was to make of her a "siren" seducing him from his true blessedness, Beatrice.⁴ To follow worldly activities in a Godly spirit is man's bounden duty; to follow them in a worldly spirit—for their own sakes—is, as Aquinas said, "perversity." "Amicitia

¹ *Purg.*, xxxiii, 13-15.

² *Conv.*, II, xlii, 27-29.

³ xxxviii, 1-3.

⁴ *Purg.*, xxxi, 45.

hujus mundi, inimica . . . Dei."¹ Enmity with God is anticipation of hell. But by divine grace Dante was warned in time.

So low he fell that all expedients
For his redemption were already vain
Else than to show him the lost folk.²

Dante believed himself the object of a special providence. He believed that, like St. Paul, an "abundance of visions" guided him. These called him from the withdrawn life of contemplation to active service in the affairs of men, the "civil life." According to his capacity, he was given Martha's "good part," not Mary's "best part."³ Though he might yearn toward Beatrice in heaven, he was bound on earth to service of the *Donna Pietosa*.

Actually, the "active life" into which he plunged shortly after Beatrice's death was that of politics. The reward of his labors was exile. That he felt his judges to be unjust would be no bar to his recognizing in the affliction itself the hand of Providence. On his own showing, the Jews were no less unjust in crucifying Christ for that they were at the same time carrying into effect the will of God.⁴ Divine justification of his exile must lie in its warning of a more perilous and self-imposed exile of his soul from the higher *patria* of heaven. So Virgil warns him among the sons of Cain:

ye take the bait, so that the hook
Of the old adversary draws you to him;
And so availeth little curb or call.
The heavens call unto you, and wheel around you,
Displaying unto you their everlasting beauties;
And your eyes yet but looketh unto earth.
Hence doth he buffet you who seeth all things.⁵

In other words, betrayed in his weakness like St. Paul by the "angel of Satan," the *stimulus carnis*—or concupiscence, as Aquinas interprets⁶—Dante is also chastened into humility. Now the category of concupiscence in Dante's dramatic symbolism is represented, as shown above, by the *Donna Pietosa* in so far as Dante's desire of her

¹ James, 4:4.

² *Purg.*, xxx, 136-38.

³ Vulgate: *optimam partem*.

⁴ *Par.*, vii.

⁵ *Purg.* xlv, 145-51.

⁶ *Comm.*, II Cor. 12:3. Beset by the Evil One at the precise noon of his earthly day—"nel mezzo del cammin"—Dante may possibly have had in mind the "noon-devil," "Daemonium meridianum" (Ps. 91:6), theologically identified with the proneness to worldliness of middle life.

became inordinate. But just as the other and benignant aspect of the *Donna Pietosa* comes in the *Commedia* to be represented by Matilda, so this her malignant influence may well, as Signor Santi argues, be represented by the Medusa-like siren, *la Pietra*. In other words, the influence of the *Donna Pietosa* was equivocal—good or bad according to Dante's reaction upon it. Matilda and *la Pietra* may represent univocally the divergent potentialities of the influence of the ambiguous *Donna Pietosa*.¹

Although, both literally and symbolically, Dante's desire of *la Pietra*—if indeed she is to be identified with the *pargoletta* of Beatrice's rebuke²—was admittedly culpable, it is still rigorously possible even here for him to maintain that the "moving cause" of his praise of her was "not passion, but virtue." Again, in the *retrospect* he sees how by divine grace his weakness was made strength; therefore, like St. Paul, he will glory in his weakness. "Libenter igitur gloriabor in infirmitatibus meis, ut inhabitet in me virtus Christi."³ In other words, as before in the case of his Second Love, behind his will was the will of God.⁴ Not his "passion," but the "virtue" of divine Love was the true "moving cause" of his conduct, itself needful to bring him to contrition. He must experience subjectively that "hell" which he objectifies in the great confession of his poem. Thanks to his *inordinate* desire of her, *la Pietra*, he says,

robs me of that
Whereof I have most thirst.⁵

Later enlightenment has shown him that his truly greatest thirst is for Wisdom. Unconsciously, therefore, he had declared that his inordinate love had robbed him of that. And so again he had spoken prophetically when he had said, "For her I boil in the hot caldron."⁶ For the soul which has lost Wisdom is in danger of hell-fire. And in a consistent continuation of the *Convivio* Dante might have moralized these passages of his *canzone* on the text of Job: "Si deceptum est

¹ By analogous process differentiation of the category of Reason into Reason unilluminated by Revelation, and illumined, is symbolized by Virgil and Matilda, respectively. Dogmatic and Mystic Theology by Beatrice and St. Bernard.

² *Purg.*, xxxi, 59.

³ II Cor. 12:9.

⁴ *Par.*, v, 7-12.

⁵ Quello, ond'io ho più gola. m'invola
—*Così nel mio parlar*, ll. 80-81.

⁶ per lei nel caldo borro.
—*Ibid.*, l. 60.

cor meum super muliere. . . . Ignis est usque ad perditionem devorans. . . ."¹

In fact, humbled in spirit, having paid his penitential scot of tears,² he is brought back to his true blessedness, to Beatrice. His temporary experience of "hell" had been the only way, as she said. Consolation of his exile is given him. Not ungrateful Florence, but the world is his country,³ yet only as a "threshing-floor" where he may aid in God's task of separating the chaff from the corn.⁴ His ultimate mood is in effect one with that expressed by Hugh of St. Victor in the *Didascalicon*.⁵

All the world is a place of exile to philosophers. It is a great beginning of virtue for the mind to learn by degrees, by exercise, first to change these visible and transitory things, that afterwards it may be able also to relinquish them. He is yet delicate to whom his native land is sweet. But he is already strong to whom every soil is his country, and he is perfect to whom the whole world is a place of exile. The first has fixed his love on the world, the second has scattered it, the last has quenched it.

Dante fixing his love on the *Donna Pietosa* inordinately, or upon *la Pietra* inordinately, is the real exile from his true *patria*, having lost his way among "these visible and transitory things"—

present things

With their false pleasure turned aside my steps.⁶

Yet exile for a while he must be, serving his time as God's laborer, overseen by his Second—rather, secondary—Love, that Moral Philosophy which may reward him with earthly blessedness, promissory itself of the wages of his true mistress, his First Love and Last, Beatrice, dispenser of the heavenly blessedness which is eternal.

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

¹ 31:9, 12.

² *Purg.*, xxx, 144-45.

³ "Nos autem cui mundus est patria"—*De Vulg. Eloq.*, 1,6.

⁴ *Par.*, xxi, 151.

⁵ III, 20. I quote Gardner's translation—*Dante and the Mystics*, London, 1913, p. 150.

⁶ *Purg.*, xxxi, 34-35.

THE INFLUENCE OF GEORGE BORROW UPON PROSPER MÉRIMÉE.

Scholars who have concerned themselves with the life and writings of Mérimée have generally assumed that the descriptions of Gypsy life in *Carmen* are the fruit of the author's personal observation and first-hand study of the language and lore of that interesting people. In thus supposing *Carmen* to be a portrait painted *ad vivum* they are not wholly wrong; but the important part which the writings of Borrow play as sources of *Carmen* appears to have escaped attention. In the final chapter of *Carmen*, added after the first appearance of the story in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*,¹ Mérimée mentions Borrow's name solely to hold him up to ridicule. Always fond of mystifying his readers he throws dust in their eyes by affecting an authority of knowledge not possessed by the writer whose works he has been exploiting. But he is more ingenuous in his intimate correspondence with his Inconnue, Mlle Jenny Dacquin. He there confesses that much of his Gypsy lore was derived from Borrow: "You asked me the other day where I obtained my acquaintance with the dialect of the Gypsies. I had so many things to tell you that I forgot to reply. I got it from Mr. Borrow; his book is one of the most curious which I have read."² In view of this admission there is no need of proving that such an influence existed. The purpose of the present article is merely to examine its extent.

The Gypsy was one of the stock characters of Romanticism, and Mérimée in his earliest works exhibits the prevailing interest in the race. His mythical Clara Gazul is the offspring of a Granada canon and a gitana of the Albaicín. Her favorite ditty is: *Cuando me parió mi madre, la gitana*. His equally mythical Hyacinthe Maglanovich, the bard of *La Guzla*, owed his gift of song to the Tchingémcha or Bohemians who kidnapped him when a child. His first real Gypsy character occurs in *la Chronique du règne de Charles IX* in the person of Mila. We know that Mila is a Gypsy because we are told that

¹ *Carmen* was first published in the issue of October 1, 1845.

² *Lettres à une inconnue* (Paris, 1889), II, 289.

such is the fact. The portrait exhibits a complete lack of modeling. Not the slightest bit of local color illustrative of Gypsy life is introduced, unless the telling of fortunes and a propensity for theft may be so considered. Borrow had not yet published the results of his studies, and Mérimée was still to begin his own. But these slight allusions at least betray an interest in the subject, an interest which will quicken with the first opportunity to see and associate with the race.

That opportunity came in the year 1830 when Mérimée first visited Spain. In that year he gathered some of the material afterward woven into the fabric of *Carmen*. It was then that the Condesa de Teba (later the Condesa de Montijo) related to him the anecdote which served as the "germ" of *Carmen*, a trivial drama of jealousy and murder in which Gypsies played no part. "Il s'agissait d'un Jacques de Malaga, qui avait tué sa maîtresse, laquelle se consacrait exclusivement au public," writes Mérimée to the countess, recalling the incident fifteen years later.¹ In 1830, likewise, he wrote his article on the bandit José María. And in this same year also the Condesa de Teba introduced him to the Spanish novelist Estébanez Calderón.

Estébanez Calderón and Mérimée had much in common. Both were intimates of the Condesa de Teba, assiduous attendants at her *tertulia*, moving on a footing of easy familiarity with the aristocratic circle of Madrid; yet the Spanish *costumbrista* might have said as truly as Mérimée that he was never so in his element as "in a Spanish *venta* with muleteers and peasants of Andalusia." Both men were novelists devoted to the depiction of manners and the creation of local color. Both plumed themselves on being serious historians as well. Both were bibliophiles. Estébanez Calderón purchased books for Mérimée in Madrid; Mérimée in Paris attended book auctions in the interest of his friend. But above all Estébanez was valuable to Mérimée in the capacity of guide. He it was who introduced him to certain aspects of the low life of Madrid from which was gained a first-hand knowledge of Spanish manners. This intimacy was not suspected by even the best-informed *Mériméistes* of France until the

¹ First printed in the preface to the édition de luxe of *Carmen*, "Pour les cent bibliophiles" (Paris, 1901). Not having seen this edition, I quote from the reproduction of the letter. Cf. Pinvert, *Sur Mérimée, Notes bibliographiques et critiques* (Paris, 1908).

recent publication of seven letters addressed by Mérimée to his Spanish friend.¹ Much of this correspondence is the reverse of edifying, but reveals how helpful each friend was in the literary labors of the other.

Years afterward Estébanez Calderón received a presentation copy of *Carmen* with the inscription: "À mon maître en *chipe calli*" ("To my master in the Gypsy tongue").² In an accompanying letter he says: "Voici en attendant un petit souvenir de nos anciennes études sur la *chipe calli*, pour lequel je vous demande un coin dans votre bibliothèque."³ Estébanez Calderón was, therefore, the first who made Mérimée acquainted with the Spanish Gypsy and his language, but we may doubt whether Mérimée was able to acquire from his friend more than a few scattered phrases of the jargon. When he departed for the South he continued his investigations alone. The Gypsies of Granada excited his lively interest. Whether, as has so often been stated, he there found the original of Carmencita cannot definitely be decided. But Filon, quoting from the unedited Montijo correspondence, has indicated that at Granada he flirted with a pretty gitana, "assez farouche aux chrétiens, mais qui, pourtant, s'appropriait à la vue d'un duro."⁴ This trip "of a thousand follies" as he termed it in later life was by no means wholly devoted to frivolity. We may be confident of his sincerity when, writing from Valencia, he said: "In a foreign land, one is compelled to see everything and is always apprehensive lest a moment of idleness or disgust will make one lose a curious bit of manners."⁵

For over a decade after his first visit to Spain Mérimée's interest in the Gypsies lay dormant. It was reawakened by the successive publication of Borrow's works. The first of these, the translation of the Gospel of Luke into *caló*, appeared in 1837.⁶ That Mérimée had the patience to read this book through we know from a statement in his correspondence with Mme de la Rochejacquelein. That good

¹ Mitjana, "Lettres de Mérimée à Estébanez Calderón," *Revue Neue*, November 12 and 19, 1910, pp. 809-14 and 645-47.

² *Ibid.*, p. 809.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 612.

⁴ Filon, *Mérimée et ses amis* (Paris, 1909), p. 54.

⁵ Mosaique, *Lettre de Valence* (Paris, 1909), p. 287.

⁶ *Emble e Majaró Lucas. El evangelio según S. Lucas traducido al Romant, ó dialecto de los Gitanos de España* (Madrid, 1837).

lady, whose efforts to convert the skeptical courtier of Napoleon III are well known, had apparently been urging her friend to read his Testament. We may imagine the malicious glee with which he coolly informs her that he has even read the Gospel of Luke in Roman.¹

But two far more stimulating books were soon to follow: *The Zincali; or an Account of the Gypsies of Spain* (London, 1841)² and *The Bible in Spain* (London, 1842). Salillas has stated that serious interest in the Spanish Gypsy dates from the publication of Borrow's *Zincali*.³ The statement might well be broadened to include Gypsy studies the world over. Whatever the defects of this work from the philologist's point of view, no other writer has done anything comparable in arousing interest in the "affairs of Egypt." Superficiality and inaccuracy were not Borrow's worst faults. He dishonestly utilized the work of his predecessors in the field without giving credit.⁴ Yet many of his more scholarly successors have acknowledged that to Borrow they owed their first interest in the Gypsies. His vivid style and propensity for romancing won him a popular audience. *The Zincali* inspired a *Carmen*, a thing Pott's learned *Zigeuner* could never have done.

Naturally Estébanez Calderón was one of the first in Spain to learn of the publication of *The Zincali*. In a letter dated May 6, 1842, he requested his friend Pascual Gayangos, then residing in London, to procure him a copy. "Buy me," he writes, "the *Cancionero de burlas* of Usoz and Borrow's book on the Gypsies. He has not remembered to send me a copy, though I procured for him so many data. Tell him he does not know the word for 'manger.'"⁵ From this we see that Estébanez was not only "master of *chipe calli*" for Mérimée but for Borrow as well, a detail which has escaped the notice of that author's biographers. Mérimée's own study of *The Zincali* seems to date from August, 1844, as appears from a letter

¹ *Une Correspondence inédite* (Paris, 1897), p. 125.

² My references are to the enlarged and corrected second edition (London: John Murray, 1843).

³ Salillas, *Hampa* (Madrid, 1898), p. 130.

⁴ Cf. Groome, *The Academy*, July 13, 1874. Borrow took much from Bright's *Travels in Hungary* (Edinburgh, 1819). He was also indebted to Grellmann, though he specifically denies having seen that author's book. As we shall see he was also indebted to Estébanez Calderón.

⁵ Cf. Cánovas del Castillo, "*El Solitario*" y su tiempo (Madrid, 1883), II, 381.

which he wrote on the twenty-first of that month to his friend Grasset, French consul in Janina:

Apropos of linguistics, I have been studying for several days the jargon of the Bohemians (Zingari). Probably you have some of them in Albania as in all the Turkish provinces. Could you answer these two questions? Have they an individual tongue or only a patois? Do you know whether they know the time of their arrival in Albania and from what direction they came? There is a German who is now writing their history and who seems to me to be making a kind of romance. An English missionary or spy has made a very amusing book on the Gypsies of Spain; it is Mr. Borrow. He lies frightfully, but now and then says things both true and excellent.¹

This letter shows Mérimée, just previous to the writing of *Carmen*, eagerly seeking detailed information about a distant Gypsy tribe. Doubtless other friends like Gobineau and Francisque Michel were similarly questioned. The German referred to can only be Friedrich Pott, professor in Halle, and author of *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien*.² Mérimée had just seen the first volume of Pott's work. The second appeared in 1845, and at a joint session held May 2, 1845, the five academies conferred upon the author the Volney prize in linguistics. The *Proceedings* of the Academy fail to show whether Mérimée was instrumental in the award of that prize to Pott. Pott's work was the first rigidly scientific study of the Gypsy race and language which had appeared. He does not seem to have studied the Gypsy tongue at first-hand, but he subjected the work of others to a critical examination from the viewpoint of a trained Orientalist. It is certain that Mérimée knew Pott's book, but as a source for the *Carmen* it counts for little. Its ponderous erudition must have seemed to Mérimée *rébarbatif*.

The allusion to Borrow shows that Mérimée was not the dupe of that author's romancings; yet it hardly tallies with what Mérimée says of him elsewhere. For example he writes to the Inconnue:

What he (Borrow) relates of the Bohemians is perfectly true, and his personal observations are entirely in accord with mine save on a single

¹ Cf. *L'Intermédiaire des chercheurs et curieux*, October 16, 1892. This letter offers evidence that Mérimée was familiar with either the first or second English edition of *The Zincali*. The French translation appeared a year later: Borrow, *Esquisses de la vie des gitanoes d'Espagne* (Paris, 1845). This translation is not mentioned in the Borrow bibliography compiled by Professor Knapp and published in his biography. A more complete Borrow bibliography has just appeared: Wise, *Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of G. H. Borrow*, London, 1914.

² Halle, 1844-45.

point. In his capacity of clergyman (*sic*), he may very well have deceived himself where I, in my capacity of Frenchman and layman, was able to make conclusive experiments. What is very strange is that this man, who has the gift of tongues to such an extent that he can speak the dialect of the *calli*, has so little grammatical perspicuity that he fails to recognize at the first glance that many roots foreign to Spanish have remained in the dialect. He claims that only Sanskrit roots have been preserved.¹

In the *Carmen* also he ridicules Borrow for naïvely believing in the chastity of Gypsy women. He cites an Andalusian friend (possibly Estébanez) who had a different tale to tell. This Andalusian may have had the best possible sources of information, but the majority of Spanish writers bear out Borrow's statement. Besides, Borrow was not a clergyman, and the man who taught Isopel Berners of Mumpers Dingle to conjugate the verb "to love" in Armenian may not have been so naïve an observer after all. Mérimée's second statement is incomprehensible. Borrow did not refer all words in the language of the Spanish Gypsies to Sanskrit roots. He derived several from modern Greek, and Mérimée himself cited these same examples in *Carmen*.

Mérimée's interest in Borrow continued to the end of his life. He doubtless read with interest *Lavengro* and *Romany Rye*, though there is no record of the fact and these works did not influence his own writings. Late in life he records his disappointment on reading *Wild Wales*, a book which he had purchased for 30 francs and would gladly relinquish for 15. He further remarks that Borrow had deteriorated greatly.² The most ardent Barrovian would agree with this opinion. An allusion to the British Bible Society in the opening pages of *Lokis*, his last novel, shows that Borrow was still in his mind. He had in common with Borrow and many other Romanticists a dilettante interest in exotic tongues. At various periods of his life he studied such out-of-the-way languages as Arabic, modern Greek, Lithuanian, Armenian, Catalan, Basque, and the Celtic speech of Brittany. His knowledge of most of these dialects was superficial, and his proficiency in languages which he better understood such as Spanish and Russian has been somewhat exaggerated.³ His point of view was not that of

¹ *Lettres à une inconnue*, II, 289.

² *Ibid.*, II, 229.

³ Cf. Groussac, *Une Enigme littéraire* (Paris, 1909), p. 170: "Son savoir était si réel et si complet sur presque toutes les choses dont il parlait que, sans le vouloir, il a fait

the philologist. He studied for personal amusement and to gain local color for his books. The Gypsy speech seems to have interested him longer than most of the other languages mentioned, excepting only Russian, though writing to his friend Gobineau, February 9, 1855, he says: "I am beginning to be very rusty in *chipe calli* which I formerly jabbered with some success in Madrid."¹ In this and subsequent letters he gives ample evidence that he has studied not only the Gypsy dialects of Spain, but other European dialects of that tongue as well. He subjoins a list of 28 Gypsy words of general European use (certainly not taken from Borrow's vocabulary), and asks his friend, then secretary of the French ministry in Persia, to send him the corresponding forms used by the Gypsies of Persia. This Gobineau did, and Mérimée replies:

I have read and reread your little vocabulary of the Persian Gypsies, and from the trouble which I had in collecting a few of the words of their Spanish brothers, I understand all that the list which you have been so kind as to transcribe for me has cost you. There is certainly a striking connection between the majority of the words of your Gypsies and those of ours, and it is astonishing that an unwritten language should not alter far more among individuals situated so far from each other.²

The translation of Pushkin's *Bohémiens* is another token of the interest Mérimée took in Gypsy matters late in life.

When at last Mérimée was able to command the assistance of books, he renewed his direct observation of the Gypsy. He has left us several accounts of his methods of work:

I found at Perpignan two superb Bohemians shearing mules. I spoke *caló* to them, to the great horror of the artillery colonel who accompanied me, and it was found that I was far cleverer than they and that they rendered a startling testimony to my learning of which I was not a little proud.³

This proves no more than that Mérimée was master of a few conversational phrases. A very slight knowledge of Romany is

illusion sur d'autres aux critiques les plus déflants—comme il est arrivé pour sa connaissance du bohémien et même de l'espagnole, qu'on a fort exagérée." Groussac probably had in mind Taine's remarks on this point. Cf. Taine's introduction to the *Lettres à une inconnue*. Groussac's statement is correct except in supposing Mérimée innocent of a desire to impose upon his readers, which in view of his many mystifications we may well doubt.

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1902, 5th period, 728.

² *Ibid.*, p. 733.

³ *Lettres à une inconnue*, I, 256.

sufficient to arouse Gypsy astonishment. The following passage gives a better idea of his methods of investigation:

Yesterday they came to invite me to a party on the occasion of a Gypsy mother's accouchement. The event had taken place only two hours ago. We numbered about thirty individuals in a chamber like that which I occupied in Madrid. There were three guitars, and they sang at the top of their voices in Romany and Catalan. The society was made up of five gitanas, one of whom was tolerably pretty, and a like number of men of the same race; the rest were Catalans, thieves, I suppose, or horse jockeys, which amounts to the same thing. Nobody spoke Spanish, and mine was hardly understood. We exchanged ideas only by means of a few words of Gypsy, which greatly pleased the honorable company. "He is one of us," they said. I slipped a duro into the hand of a woman, telling her to go and get wine. These tactics had occasionally proved successful under similar circumstances in Andalusia. But the Gypsy chief immediately snatched the money from her hand and restored it to me, saying that I honored his poor house only too much. They gave me wine, and I drank without paying. On returning home, I found watch and handkerchief in my pocket. . . . The songs, all of which were unintelligible to me, had the merit of recalling to my mind Andalusia. One of them they dictated to me in Romany which I understood. It has to do with a man who speaks of his wretchedness and tells how long he has been without eating. Poor people! Would they not have been perfectly justifiable, if they had taken my money and clothes and ejected me with a beating?¹

These adventures occurred subsequent to the writing of *Carmen*, but previous to 1844 he had conducted many similar investigations among the Gypsies of Madrid, Granada, Seville, and Cordoba. He had also visited some of the tribes of Germany and the Vosges Mountains. Mérimée's opportunity for direct observation of Gypsy manners was therefore extensive. Why, then, is it necessary to seek a literary source for the *Carmen*? Because Mérimée when he set out to manufacture local color seldom dispensed with literary aid. He did, indeed, frequently dispense with direct observation. Thus, *Le Théâtre de Clara Gazul* was drawn entirely from the author's reading and imagination. Mérimée, at the time of its publication, had never set foot in Spain, South America, or any of the other countries described. Yovanovitch has ably indicated the sources of *La Guzla*.² It will be remembered that Mérimée, desiring to journey to Illyria, had written that famous mystification based upon rare books of

¹ Filon, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

² Yovanovitch, *La Guzla de Prosper Mérimée* (Paris, 1911).

travel, with the intention of later using the profits of his book to defray the expenses of a tour beyond the Adriatic which would enable him to ascertain how near he had come to the truth. The trip to Illyria never came to pass, but Mérimée did visit Corsica after having first written his little masterpiece *Mateo Falcone*, a work filled with Corsican local color. As has recently been shown, personal observation led him to make numerous alterations in later editions of the story.¹ The local color of *Lokis* is reminiscent of the author's studies on Lithuania. Not having himself visited the region described, Mérimée asked Tourgénéff to criticize the local color in it. *Colomba* and *Carmen*, on the other hand, were written after Mérimée was personally familiar with Corsica and Spain; nevertheless in writing the latter work, he depended even more upon books than upon his own eyes. And the book from which he drew most freely was Borrow's *Zincali*.

Except for the strong impulse given to Gypsy studies by the publication of the *Zincali*, *Carmen*—at least in the form in which we know it—would never have been written. The vulgar little item of police court news related by the Condesa de Teba afforded scant material for a masterpiece. It was not until Borrow's books had revived Mérimée's interest in the Gypsies that he conceived the idea of *Carmen*. This we may infer from the letter to the Condesa de Montijo (May 15, 1845) from which I have already quoted: "As I have been studying the Gypsies for some time, I have made of my heroine a Gypsy."² He had waited fifteen years before turning to literary account the story which is rightly regarded as the germ of *Carmen*. Meanwhile Borrow had published his *Zincali* (1841), *The Bible in Spain* (1842); Trujillo his *Vocabulario del dialecto gitano* (1844); Pott his *Zigeuner* (1844-45).³ *Carmen*, then, was written at

¹ Cf. Souriau, "Les Variantes de *Mateo Falcone*," *Rev. d'hist. litt. de la France*, XX, No. 2, 332-42.

² Pinvert, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

³ Without attempting to give a complete bibliography of works dealing with the Gypsies prior to 1845 (for such a list see Pott), the following are the more important works which Mérimée may have used: Grollman, *Die Zigeuner* (Leipzig, 1873); Hoyland, *A Historical Survey of the Customs, Habits, and Present State of the Gypsies* (York, 1816); Puchmayer, *Romani Chib* (Prague, 1821); Passa, *Essai historique sur les Gitanoes* (Paris, 1827); Bischoff, *Deutsch-Zigeunerisches Wörterbuch* (Ilmenau, 1827); Kindler, *Mitteilungen über die Zigeuner* (Nürnberg, 1831); J. M., *Historia de los Gitanos* (Barcelona and Madrid, 1832, cited by Borrow); Graffunder, *Ueber die Sprache der Zigeuner* (Erfurt, 1835); Tetmer, *Geschichte der Zigeuner* (Weimar, 1835); Heister, *Ethnographische und geschichtliche Notizen über die Zigeuner* (Königsberg, 1842). Most of these works I have handled and can find no evidence that Mérimée used any of them in writing *Carmen*, except for a few words which he may have taken from German glossaries.

a time when definite information about the Gypsies was beginning to replace the imaginings of the preceding decade. The day of the Preciosas and Esmeraldas was past. The heroine of the Condesa de Teba's story was not a Gypsy. Mérimée alters facts in order to provide himself with an opportunity of creating local color and to air his newly acquired knowledge of the Gypsy tongue and Gypsy manners. Similarly, in order to display his scanty knowledge of Basque, the original Jacques de Málaga is transformed into Don José Navarra.¹ It remains now to examine the *Carmen* in detail and to point out what facts Mérimée drew from Borrow.

First of all, the *Carmen* contains a number of Gypsy proverbs, all but two of which are taken from Borrow's collection in the *Zincali*: "Chuquel sos pirela, cocal terela" ("The dog who walks finds a bone"); "Or esorjié de or narsichislé sin chismar lachinguel" ("The extreme of a dwarf is to spit largely");² "Len sos sonsi abela pani o reblandani terela" ("The river which makes a noise has either water or stones"). Here Mérimée corrects an error of Borrow who had written *bela* for *abela*, but himself has *reblendani* instead of the correct *reblandi*. That Mérimée did not follow his authority slavishly is shown also by the following example: Borrow writes: "Aunsos me dicas vriardó de jorpoey ne sirlo braco" ("Although thou seest me dressed in wool, I am no sheep"); Mérimée gives it thus: "Me dicas vriardá de jorpoey, bus ne sino braco." He has omitted the word for "although" and substituted that for "but." He has changed the agreement of the participle from masculine to feminine to suit his context, and lastly he has corrected the misprint of *sirlo* to *sino*. Nobody has hitherto pointed out that the *Carmen* ends with one of those pretty mystifications of which Mérimée was so childishly fond. The last sentence of *Carmen* contains a proverb not found in Borrow: "En retudi panda nasti abela macha" ("A fly does not enter a closed mouth"). This is nothing in the world but the common Italian

¹ Mérimée may have been indebted for his knowledge of Basque to his friend, Francisque Michel, professor in Bordeaux, the future author of *Le Pays basque*, with whom he maintained a constant correspondence. In that book Michel devotes a chapter to the Basque Gypsies. He also has something to say of the Gypsies in his *Histoire des races maudites de la France et de l'Espagne* (Paris, 1847).

² In all the editions of *Carmen* this is rendered: "La promesse d'un nain c'est de cracher loin." This is nonsense. For *promesse* read *prouesse*. This misprint which dates from the first issue of *Carmen* in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* has never before been corrected.

proverb: "In bocca chiusa non entró mai mosca" which Mérimée has amused himself by rendering into *caló* with the aid of Borrow's glossary. But even this was, I think, suggested by Borrow. The one proverb given in the *Zincali* without a Gypsy equivalent runs thus: "The poor fool who closes his mouth never winneth a dollar." This may have suggested to Mérimée the well-known Italian proverb which is such a close equivalent. That he was capable of writing a sentence in the *caló* dialect is proved by the correspondence with Estébanez Calderón. Another proverb also seems to be the author's own invention: "Sarapia sat pesquital ne punzava" ("Gale avec plaisir ne démange pas"). None of these proverbs is taken from Pott's collection or from any other printed source then available.

We have Mérimée's own statement that he was familiar with several glossaries of the Gypsies' dialects; but in writing *Carmen*, Borrow's vocabulary was his chief aid. Nearly all the Gypsy words and phrases used in *Carmen* may there be found. E.g., *baji*, *rommani*, *chipe calli*, *payllo*, *bar lachi*, *romalis*, *rom*, *romi*, *caló*, *majari*, *ustilar á pastesas*, *lillipendi*, *erani* (Borrow, *erañi*), *minchorró* (Borrow, *minchoró*), *bari*, *crallisa*, *pani*, *manro*, *lon*, *jamar*, *lillar*, *gras*, *graste*, *gris*, *fila*, *sarapia* (Borrow, *zarapia*). He accepts Borrow's etymologies in the case of three words without giving credit—proof positive that the *Zincali* was his source: *cocal* from Greek *kokkallon*; *petalli* (Borrow, *petali*) from Greek *petalon*; *cafi* from Greek *kaphi*. He occasionally makes slight changes in the orthography which seem to show that his own observations were different. There are only a few Gypsy words not found in Borrow: *tchouri*, a variant of *chori*; *rommané tshavé*; *firla*, a variant of *fila*. These, as well as the statement regarding perfects in *-ium* he took from some German source; it would be impossible to say which. He further gives a sentence which he says he took down from the lips of a Gypsy in the Vosges: "Singo, singo honti hi mulo." This is clearly not the *caló* dialect.

Many a detail in the plot and local color of *Carmen* was taken directly out of Borrow's works, though there are a few resemblances which may be nothing more than coincidences. Two such close observers as Borrow and Mérimée visiting Spain at about the same period must have seen many of the same things. Nevertheless, for

the details which I shall now mention the Frenchman must have been indebted to the Englishman.

The narrator of *Carmen* meets the highwayman at the bottom of a mountainous gorge through which runs a rivulet. The *mise en scène* is identical with that in which Borrow's traveler has his sinister encounter with the Gypsy horde. The description of the women bathing in the Guadalquivir is reminiscent of a similar picture in the *Bible in Spain*. The description of Carmen in anger suggests Borrow's portrait of the "gitana of Seville": "Elle s'avavançait en se balançant sur ses hanches comme une pouliche du haras de Cordoue . . . le poing sur la hanche, effrontée comme une vraie bohémienne qu'elle était." Borrow's gitana of Seville "stamps on the ground, and placing her hands on her hips, she moves quickly to right and left, advancing and retreating in a side-long direction." In describing Carmen's dress Mérimée says: "Elle avait un jupon rouge fort court qui laissait voir des bas blancs," etc. Borrow quotes the Spanish writer J. M—— to the effect that the Gypsy women wear "a scarlet colored *saya*, which only covers a part of the leg." The *romalis* dance is frequently referred to and described in the *Zincali*. What Mérimée tells us of the *bar lachi* or loadstone and the charms wrought with it is information derived from Borrow. In describing the riot of a Gypsy wedding Borrow tells of their lavish expenditure for *yemas* and other sweetmeats which they strew upon the floor and dance upon. Carmen on the occasion of her quasi-marriage with Don José purchases sweetmeats lavishly, breaks the *yemas* against the wall, smashes crockery, and dances madly upon the débris. "I pay my debts," says Carmen, "that is the law of the Gypsies." Borrow expatiates at length on the "Gypsy law," especially emphasizing the antipathy of the race to remaining in debt and the fidelity which the *romi* must observe toward her *rom*. We have seen that Mérimée was a skeptic in the matter of Gypsy chastity, but even here he saves himself from criticism by making Carmen a half-blood, and on one occasion makes her say to her lover: "I should like to be your *romi*; but that is nonsense; it is impossible." When Don José inquires Carmen's whereabouts, he is told that she has gone to Laloro (Portugal). Borrow mentions Laloro as a favorite resort of Spanish Gypsies who are pursued by justice. "The Affairs of Egypt" is a

phrase of frequent recurrence in Borrow's works; compare Mérimée's "Les Affaires d'Égypte." Similarly one author has "Flamenca de Roma," the other "Flamande de Rome." Don José kills his lieutenant. Whether the hero of the Condesa de Teba's story committed any other murder than that of his wife we do not know; but it is interesting to note that the husband of the Gypsy crone in the *Bible in Spain* was a soldier who murdered his sergeant, after which the two took refuge among the Moors of Barbary. A sleeping potion is administered to Don José. This is the Gypsy *drao* mentioned in Borrow. Carmen's exploits on the highway were unquestionably suggested by those of Borrow's one-eyed feminine *contrabandista*, La Tuerta. As Mérimée had no occasion for two female smugglers, La Tuerta suggested the name for a male character, Le Borgne. La Tuerta dealt chiefly in cotton goods, Carmen in *cotonnades*. Carmen frees her husband from jail. "Carmen a si bien embobeliné le chirurgien du presidio, qu'elle en a obtenu la liberté de son rom." In the *Zincali* a Gypsy says: "My wife soon got me out; she went to the lady of the corregidor, to whom she told a most wonderful *bahi*, promising treasures and titles, and I wot not what; so I was set at liberty." Carmen also tried to liberate Don José from jail by somewhat different means. Carmen sang one of the songs in which the Gypsies invoke María Padilla. Borrow gives one of those songs in full. Mérimée as the future historian of Peter the Cruel was naturally interested in this bit of folk-lore.¹ Mérimée mentions the well-known Gypsy trick by which a Gypsy woman induces a credulous victim to tie some gold pieces in a handkerchief as a means of discovering a buried treasure, whereupon the Gypsy disappears with the handkerchief and its contents. This is the *hokano baro*, or "great trick," of the Gypsies which Borrow describes at length. The trick is also described in some of the old Spanish picaresque novels, but Mérimée probably did not resort to such an out-of-the-way source.²

The general account of the Gypsies with which *Carmen*, in its final form, ends is the result of Mérimée's wide reading on this subject. Nevertheless, here as elsewhere, Borrow is his chief source.

¹ Cf. Schuchardt, "Los cantes flamencos," *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, V, 280.

² Cf. Salillas' very interesting chapter on "Los gitanos en la novela picaresca," *op. cit.*, pp. 142 ff.

Some of his generalizations about Gypsy customs and characteristics are so vague that it would be futile to attempt to indicate an exact source; but we may be sure that he draws from Borrow in giving the etymologies of the three words *cocal*, *petalli*, and *cafi* referred to above. Mérimée further imitates Borrow in connecting thieves' slang with the Romany. The author of the *Zincali* had shown how much the criminal jargons of Spain and England owed to the Gypsy tongue. This suggested to Mérimée a few similar remarks on the language of French thieves. Both writers quote Vidocq's *Mémoires*. In this connection it may be remarked that Mérimée's etymology of *fri-mousse*, though apparently overlooked by subsequent lexicographers, who naturally do not turn to novels for philological facts, appears far more plausible than any other derivation that has been proposed. It is in this last chapter that Mérimée most unkindly heaps ridicule upon the head of the author whose works he has so thoroughly exploited.

In the foregoing study I have made no attempt to study all the possible sources of *Carmen*. The work reflects many of its author's variegated interests and is indicative of wide reading in numerous unrelated fields. I have merely sought to show that in his study of the Gypsies Borrow was Mérimée's most important, though not his sole, literary guide; and of that a careful comparison of the two works leaves not the slightest doubt.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

NOTES SUR LE PROLOGUE D'“ATALA”

I

Il est peu de passages dans l'œuvre de Chateaubriand qui soient plus connus que la description du Mississippi qui se trouve au début d'*Atala*; il en est peu aussi qui aient été plus discutés et plus critiqués.¹ Dès la publication du livre, le critique de la *Décade philosophique, littéraire et politique*, dans le numéro du 10 floréal, an IX, sans mettre en doute l'exactitude des “couleurs” employées par Chateaubriand, se récriait devant “les ours enivrés de raisins qui chancellent sur les branches des ormeaux.” Le passage piqua évidemment au vif Chateaubriand qui, dans une note du *Génie du Christianisme* (IV, 180), appela à la rescousse pour se justifier et “Carver, *Travels through the Interior Parts of North America*, p. 443, 3d ed., London, 1791, et John Bartram, *Description of East Florida*, 3d ed., London, 1768, et Charlevoix, *Voyage dans l'Amérique septentrionale*, tome IV, lettre 44, pp. 175, édition de Paris, 1744, et Imley (*sic*) qui dit en propres termes que les ours s'enivrent de raisins (intoxicated with grapes).”

L'auteur tenait à prouver “l'exactitude scrupuleuse” de ses descriptions de la nature, et dans la préface de l'édition d'*Atala-René* (édition de 1805) il est revenu encore une fois sur le sujet: “des notes ajoutées à cette édition d'*Atala*, disait-il, m'auraient aisément justifié; mais s'il avait fallu en mettre dans tous les endroits où chaque lecteur pouvait en avoir besoin, elles auraient bientôt surpassé la longueur de l'ouvrage” (Préface, p. 7).

Malgré une affirmation aussi nette, les critiques ne se sont pas avoués vaincus. En 1832, un voyageur qui signe René Mersenne, après avoir pris connaissance d'un article de l'*American Quarterly Review* (déc. 1827, p. 460), entreprit de vérifier sur place la véracité de Chateaubriand. Il fit le voyage du Niagara, descendit le Mississippi, et arriva à la conclusion suivante:

Il faut donc confesser que les hérons bleus de M. de Chateaubriand, ses flamants roses, ses perroquets à tête jaune voyageant de compagnie avec des

¹ J. Bédier, *Etudes critiques* (Paris, 1903); E. Dick, *Les Plagats de Chateaubriand* (Berne, 1905) et *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, XIII, 228-45; Emma Kate Armstrong, *Modern Language Publications*, XXII, 345-70; Madison Stathers, *Chateaubriand et l'Amérique* (Grenoble, 1905).

crocodiles et des serpents verts sur des îles flottantes de pistia et de nénuphar, plus son vieux bison à la barbe antique et limoneuse, dieu mugissant du fleuve; plus ses ours qui s'enivrent de raisins au bout des longues avenues, là où il n'y a pas d'avenues; plus ses cariboux qui se baignent dans des lacs, là où il n'y a pas de lacs; plus la grande voix du Meschacébé qui s'élève en passant sous les monts, là où il n'y a pas de monts; plus les mille merveilles de ces bords, qui font du Meschacébé l'un des quatre fleuves du Paradis terrestre, sont des contes à dormir debout, et que les bords de la Garonne eux-mêmes n'auraient pu inspirer.

Sainte-Beuve eut connaissance des lettres de Mersenne et leur emprunta un trait ou deux (*Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire*, I, 207); mais sans mettre sérieusement en doute la véracité de Chateaubriand, l'accusant tout au plus d'avoir remanié d'autorité ses souvenirs.

C'est depuis les études de M. Bédier que les attaques se sont multipliées. Mlle Armstrong s'est spirituellement moquée de la couleur locale de Chateaubriand; M. Stathers qui n'est pourtant point suspect d'hostilité à l'égard de l'auteur d'*Atala* n'a pas osé le défendre dans le détail, et M. Dick l'a vivement pris à parti. Dans l'ensemble, on paraît avoir adopté l'attitude incrédule et déçue pointée que le fils du maréchal Ney avait prise après un voyage en Amérique:

Avant d'avoir vu le Mississipi, [écrivait-il] je ne m'en faisais pas une image moins séduisante que celle du Meschacébé d'*Atala*. . . . Mais c'est en vain que je cherchais à me reconnaître dans le pays que j'avais sous les yeux par les descriptions du livre. . . . J'étais réellement déçu en me trouvant ainsi en face de la réalité. La description de ce fleuve, dans *Atala*, est faite par quelqu'un qui ne l'a jamais vu.¹

On pourrait s'en tenir là, et moi-même après avoir indiqué un emprunt fait par Chateaubriand à Carver, dans cette fameuse description (*Modern Philology*, IX, 129-49) j'ai cru que les hérons bleus, les serpents verts et les flamants roses n'avaient jamais existé que dans l'imagination de Chateaubriand. Pour qui est familier avec les procédés de composition de l'auteur d'*Atala*, il y a cependant quelque difficulté à admettre que l'homme qui a suivi si fidèlement les ouvrages de Bartram, de Carver, et de Charlevoix dans le *Voyage en Amérique*, et même dans *Atala*, se soit fié à son imagination quand

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, I (1883), 531-32, cité par M. Bédier, p. 134.

il s'agissait de peindre le panorama du Mississipi. Il reste aussi cette affirmation de l'auteur qu'il aurait pu démontrer l'exactitude de ce tableau par des notes dont l'étendue aurait dépassé celle du texte. Ce travail qu'il a dédaigné de faire, il est cependant possible de le faire aujourd'hui. C'est le dossier qu'il avait sous les yeux au moment où il écrivait le Prologue d'*Atala* que nous avons voulu essayer de reconstituer. Pour cela il nous a suffi de consulter les auteurs que Chateaubriand lui-même nous a indiqués comme ses autorités; nous y avons cependant ajouté quelques ouvrages que Chateaubriand a pu connaître mais qu'il n'a pas expressément cités, et plusieurs autres qui n'ont paru qu'après *Atala*, mais qui confirment la vérité du tableau du Mississipi. J'ai eu plus particulièrement recours à Marc Casteby, *Histoire Naturelle de la Caroline, de la Floride et des Îles Bahamas, contenant les desseins des Oiseaux, animaux, poissons, serpens, insectes et plantes . . . avec leur description en anglais et en français*, Londres, 1737, 2 vols. in 8; à Thomas Ansbury, *Journal d'un voyage fait dans l'intérieur de l'Amérique septentrionale . . . traduit de l'anglais par M. Noël*, Paris, 1793, 2 vols. in 8; à H. M. Brackenridge, *Recollections of Persons and Places in the West*, Philadelphia, 1834; enfin à Elliott Coues, *Key to North American Birds*, nouv. éd., Boston, 1903. J'ai cru utile de reproduire fidèlement le texte de la première édition d'*Atala*, plus près des sources que le texte des éditions suivantes; pour les autres ouvrages de Chateaubriand je me suis servi de l'édition des *œuvres complètes* de 1826.

On pourra voir dans les pages suivantes où "les notes surpassent la longueur de l'ouvrage" avec quel soin minutieux Chateaubriand s'est renseigné; on y pourra étudier sur le vif ses procédés de travail et de composition; on pourra se rendre compte du labeur auquel s'est astreint l'auteur d'*Atala* pour rendre sa documentation aussi exacte que le permettaient les ouvrages qu'il avait à sa disposition.

A) La France possédoit autrefois dans l'Amérique septentrionale, un vaste empire, qui s'étendoit depuis le Labrador jusqu'aux Florides, et depuis les rivages de l'Atlantique jusqu'aux lacs les plus reculés du haut Canada.

Quatre grands fleuves, ayant leurs sources dans les mêmes montagnes, divisoient ces régions immenses: le fleuve Saint-Laurent, qui se perd à l'Est dans le golfe de son nom; la rivière de l'Ouest, qui porte ses eaux à des mers inconnues; le fleuve Bourbon, qui se précipite du midi au nord

dans la baie d'Hudson; et le Meschacebé, qui descendant du nord au midi, s'ensevelit dans le golfe du Mexique.

Ce dernier fleuve, dans un cours de plus de mille lieues, arrose une délicieuse contrée que les habitants des Etats-Unis appellent le nouvel Eden, et à qui les François ont laissé le doux nom de Louisiane. Mille autres fleuves, tributaires du Meschacebé, le Missouri, l'Illinois, l'Akansa, l'Ohio, le Wabache, le Tenase, l'engraissent de leur limon, et la fertilisent de leurs eaux.

Les éléments principaux de ces paragraphes se retrouvent dans le *Voyage en Amérique*:

Au bout de la vallée, et loin par-delà, on aperçoit la cimes des montagnes hyperboréennes, où Dieu a placé la source des quatre plus grands fleuves de l'Amérique septentrionale. Nés dans le même berceau, ils vont après un cours de douze cents lieues, se mêler aux quatre points de l'horizon, à quatre océans: le Mississipi se perd au midi, dans le golfe Mexicain; le Saint-Laurent se jette, au levant, dans l'Atlantique; l'Ontawais se précipite, au nord, dans les mers du Pôle; et le fleuve de l'Ouest porte, au couchant, la tribu de ses ondes à l'Océan de Nontouka (*Voyage en Amérique*, p. 67).

M. E. Dick (p. 34) a vu dans ce passage du *Voyage* un emprunt à Beltrami dont l'ouvrage ne fut publié qu'en 1823. Il est bien évident que tout au contraire Chateaubriand n'a fait que reproduire dans le *Voyage* des notes déjà utilisées pour *Atala*. Il n'est du reste pas original et s'il n'a pu se servir de Beltrami, et pour cause, il a combiné ici deux passages de Carver. "La source des quatre grands fleuves qui prennent naissance à quelques lieues seulement les uns des autres, vers le centre de ce vaste continent; savoir, la rivière Bourbon qui se jette dans la baie de Hudson, celle de Saint-Laurent, le Mississipi et l'Orégon ou la rivière de l'Ouest qui verse ses eaux dans la mer Pacifique. . . .¹ Ailleurs Carver avait dit: "Les quatre principaux fleuves de l'Amérique Septentrionale, savoir le fleuve Saint-Laurent, le Mississipi, la rivière Bourbon, et l'Orégon ou la rivière de l'Ouest, prennent leurs sources dans un petit espace de terrain assez circonscrit. . . . Du lieu de leurs sources à la baie de Saint-Laurent à l'Est, au golfe du Mexique au Sud, à la baie de Hudson au Nord, et au détroit d'Anian ou à la mer Pacifique à l'Ouest, il y a au moins deux mille lieues" (Carver, pp. 47-48).

¹ Carver, *Voyage dans les parties intérieures de l'Amérique septentrionale*, trad. française, Paris, 1784, introduction, p. xxi.

B) Quand tous ces fleuves sont gonflés des déluges de l'hiver; quand les tempêtes ont abattu des pans entiers de forêts; le Temps assemble sur toutes les sources, les arbres déracinés. Il les unit avec des lianes, il les cimente avec des vases, il y plante de jeunes arbrisseaux, et lance son ouvrage sur les ondes. Chariés par les vagues écumantes, ces radeaux descendent de toutes parts au Meschacébé. Le vieux fleuve s'en empare, et les pousse à son embouchure, pour y former une nouvelle branche. Par intervalle, il élève sa grande voix, en passant sous les monts, et répand ses eaux débordées autour des colonnades des forêts, et des pyramides des tombeaux indiens: c'est le Nil des déserts. Mais la grâce est toujours unie à la magnificence dans les scènes de la nature: et tandis que le courant du milieu entraîne vers la mer les cadavres des pins et des chênes; on voit sur les deux courants latéraux remonter, le long des rivages, des îles flottantes de Pistia et de Nénuphar, dont les roses jaunes s'élèvent comme de petits pavillons. Des serpens verts, des hérons bleus, de flamman roses, de jeunes crocodiles s'embarquent, passagers sur ces vaisseaux de fleurs, et la colonie, déployant au vent ses voiles d'or, va aborder, endormie, dans quelque anse retirée du fleuve.

Ici Chateaubriand a consulté au moins deux auteurs. La première partie de cette description me paraît surtout devoir à Imlay, la seconde à Bartram. On en jugera par les passages suivants:

The bars that cross most of these small channels, opened by the current, have been multiplied by means of trees carried down with the streams; one of which stopped by its roots or branches, in a shallow part, is sufficient to obstruct the passage of a thousand more, and to fix them at the same place. . . . No human force being sufficient for removing them, the mud carried down by the river serves to bind and cement them together. . . . In less than ten years, canes and shrubs grow on them, and form points and islands, which forcibly shift the bed of the river. . . . It is certain that when La Salle sailed down the Mississippi to the sea, the opening of that river was very different from what it is at present. . . . The slime which the annual floods of the river Mississippi leave on the surface of the adjacent shores may be compared with that of the Nile (G. Imlay, *A Topographical Description of the Western Territory of North America*, 3d ed., London, 1797, pp. 404, 405, 410).

Les courants latéraux ou contre-courants sont trop connus pour qu'il soit nécessaire d'insister, tous les voyageurs en ont parlé; mais ces courants latéraux transportent des îles flottantes que Bartram avait vues non sur le Mississippi, mais sur la rivière Saint Jean dans la Floride orientale.

Je remis de bonne heure à la voile [dit Bartram], sur la rivière Saint Jean, et je vis ce jour là de grandes quantités de *pistia stratiotes*, plante aquatique très singulière. Elle forme des fies flottantes dont quelques-unes ont une très grande étendue et qui voguent au gré des vents et des eaux. . . . Quand les grosses pluies, les grands vents font subitement élever les eaux de la rivière, il se détache de la côte de grandes portions de ces fies flottantes. Ces flots mobiles offrent le plus aimable spectacle: ils ne sont qu'un amas des plus humbles productions de la nature, et pourtant ils troublent et déçoivent l'imagination. L'illusion est d'autant plus complète qu'au milieu de ces plantes en fleurs, on voit des groupes d'arbrisseaux, de vieux troncs d'arbres abattus par les vents et habités et peuplés de crocodiles, de serpents, de grenouilles, de loutres, de corbeaux, de hérons, de courlis, de choucas (Bartram, *Travels through North and South America*, Philadelphia, 1791; trad. française, Paris, an vii, I, 167; cité par M. Bédier, p. 265).

L'emprunt fait par Chateaubriand à Bartram est manifeste; il est cependant probable que Chateaubriand l'a complété par quelque autre ouvrage, car ni les hérons bleus, ni les serpents verts ne sont des animaux imaginaires.

Casteby décrit deux espèces de serpents verts: le serpent vert tacheté, *anguis viridis maculatus*, et le serpent vert proprement dit, *anguis viridis*, et en donne des reproductions en couleur (Casteby, II, 53, 57).

Le héron bleu est probablement l'*ardea herodias*, ou grand héron bleu, qui se trouve dans toutes les parties de l'Amérique du Nord, jusqu'au Labrador et à l'Alaska (Casteby, I, 76; E. Coues, p. 875).

On est plus étonné de rencontrer des flamants roses sur les bords du Mississipi. Casteby qui décrit cette espèce et en donne une reproduction en couleur ne l'a rencontrée qu'aux fies Bahamas (Casteby, I, 75). Cependant Coues indique comme habitat du *flamingo* ou *phoenicopterus ruber* les Bahamas, la Floride, le Golfe du Mexique, et peut-être même la Caroline du Sud. De plus, le même auteur étudiant l'ibis rouge, *eudocimus ruber*, renvoie à Audubon qui, en juillet 1821, vit en Louisiane un échantillon de cette espèce très rare aujourd'hui aux Etats-Unis. Ibis ou flamant, peu importe, l'essentiel est d'établir la possibilité de l'existence d'un grand oiseau rose sur les bords du Mississipi. Chateaubriand pourrait bien ici comme en beaucoup d'autres endroits avoir raison contre ses critiques. Nous verrons plus loin que ce n'est pas le seul passage où il a eu recours à Casteby pour se documenter.

C) Mais qui pourroit peindre les sites du Meschacébé? Depuis son embouchure jusqu'à la jonction de l'Ohio, le tableau le plus extraordinaire suit le cours de ses ondes. Sur le bord occidental, des savanes se déroulent à perte de vue: leurs flots de verdure, en s'éloignant, semblent, par une progression insensible, monter dans l'azur du ciel, où ils s'évanouissent. Quelquefois un bison chargé d'années, fendant les flots à la nage, se vient coucher parmi les hautes herbes dans une île du Meschacébé. A son front orné de deux croissans, à sa barbe antique et limoneuse, vous le prendriez pour le dieu mugissant du fleuve, qui jette un œil satisfait sur la grandeur de ses ondes, et la sauvage abondance de ses rives.

Telle est la scène sur le bord occidental; mais elle change tout-à-coup sur la rive opposée, et forme un admirable contraste. Suspendus sur le cours des ondes, groupés sur les rochers et sur les montagnes, dispersés dans les vallées, des arbres de toutes les formes, de toutes les couleurs, de tous les parfums, se mêlent, croissent ensemble, montent dans les airs à des hauteurs qui fatiguent les regards.

Une des phrases de cette description se retrouve presque textuellement dans le *Voyage en Amérique*; il s'agit il est vrai de montagnes et non de savanes, mais la notation est la même: "d'autres collines parallèles, couronnées de forêts, s'élèvent derrière la première colline, fuient en montant de plus en plus dans le ciel, jusqu'à ce que leur sommet frappé de lumière devienne de la couleur du ciel et s'évanouisse" (*Voyage*, 34). Chateaubriand n'est d'ailleurs pas original ici, c'est à Imlay qu'il a emprunté le trait essentiel de ce paysage: "the eye receding, finds new beauties in the rising hills of Silver creek, which, stretching obliquely to the north-west, proudly rise higher and higher as they extend, until their illumined summits imperceptibly vanish" (Imlay, p. 34).

Chez Carver, Chateaubriand a trouvé le contraste entre les deux rives:

Ce fleuve a de chaque côté une foule de montagnes tout le long de son cours: et ces montagnes tantôt s'approchent, et tantôt s'éloignent considérablement. Le terrain entre ces montagnes est en général couvert d'herbes avec quelques bouquets de bois dispersés çà et là, près desquels on voit des troupeaux de cerfs et d'élans qui paissent tranquillement dans ces vastes solitudes. En plusieurs endroits on aperçoit des pyramides de rochers qui ressemblent à de vieilles tours en ruines, dans d'autres on voit des précipices effrayants, et ce qu'il y a de plus remarquable, c'est que tandis qu'un côté présente cet aspect, le côté opposé est couvert de la plus belle verdure jusqu'à son sommet. On jouit là d'une vue dont la beauté et l'étendue surpassent tout ce que l'imagination peut se figurer. Qu'on se représente

des plaines verdoyantes, des prairies couvertes de fruits, des îles nombreuses, le tout rempli d'une variété d'arbres fruitiers, comme des noyers, des érables à sucre, des vignes chargées de riches grappes et de pruniers succombant sous le poids de leurs fruits: qu'on se figure ce riche spectacle rehaussé par la perspective d'un superbe fleuve roulant majestueusement son cours aussi loin que la vue peut s'étendre (Carver, p. 31).

D) Les vignes sauvages, les bignonias, les colocintes s'entrelacent au pied de ces arbres, escaladent leurs rameaux, grimpent à l'extrémité des branches, s'élancent de l'érable au tulipier, du tulipier à l'alcée, en formant mille grottes, mille voutes, mille portiques. Souvent égarées d'arbre en arbre, ces lianes traversent des bras de rivières, sur lesquels elles jettent des ponts et des arches de fleurs. Alors les chaînes de feuillage, les pommes d'or, les grappes empourprées, tout pend en festons sur les ondes. Du sein de ces massifs embaumés, le superbe magnolia élève son cône immobile. Surmonté de ses roses blanches, il domine tous ces berceaux, et n'a d'autre rival que le palmier qui balance légèrement auprès de lui ses éventails de verdure.

Bartram avait écrit:

It is very pleasant to observe the banks of the river ornamented with hanging garlands, composed of varieties of climbing vegetables, both shrubs and plants, forming perpendicular green walls, with projecting jambs, pilasters, and deep apartments, twenty or thirty feet high, and completely covered with *Glycine frutescens*, *Glyc. apios*, *Vitis labrusca*, *Vitis vulpina*, *Rajana*, *Hedera quinquefolia*, *Hedera arborea*. . . . *Bignonia crucigera*, and various species of *Convolvulus*, particularly an amazing tall climber of this genus, or perhaps an *Ipomea*. . . . It is exceedingly curious to behold the Wild Squash climbing over the lofty limbs of the trees; its yellow fruit, somewhat the size and figure of a large orange, pendant from the extremities of the limbs over the water (Bartram, pp. 134-35).

Il est facile de reconnaître dans les pommes d'or qui dans le texte de Chateaubriand font tout d'abord naître l'idée d'oranges le très prosaïque fruit de la colocinte ou "wild squash" de Bartram.

Le magnolia a été décrit plusieurs fois par Bartram et dans des termes qui se ressemblent tellement qu'il est difficile de distinguer de quel passage Chateaubriand a fait usage. "It is a tree perfectly erect," dit Bartram à un endroit, "rising in the form of a beautiful column, and supporting a head like an obtuse cone" (*ibid.*, p. 84). Ailleurs, il le montre poussant à côté de palmiers nains et continue: "but what appears very extraordinary is to behold there depressed and degraded, the glorious and pyramidal magnolia grandiflora, associated amongst these vile dwarfs, and even some of them rising

above it, though not five feet high; yet still showing large and expansive white fragrant blossoms" (*ibid.*, pp. 169-70). Chateaubriand semble bien avoir combiné ces deux passages, non sans transformer en arbres majestueux les arbustes rabougris qu'avait vus Bartram.

E) Pour embellir encore ces retraites, l'inépuisable main du Créateur y fit une multitude d'animaux, dont les jeux et les amours répandent la vie de toutes parts. De l'extrémité des avenues, on aperçoit des ours enivrés de raisins, qui chancellent sur les branches des ormeaux; des troupes de cariboux se baignent dans un lac, des écureuils noirs se jouent dans l'épaisseur des feuillages; des oiseaux moqueurs, des colombes virginienues, de la grosseur d'un passereau, descendent sur les gazons rougis par les fraises; des perroquets verts à tête jaune, des piverts empourprés, des cardinaux de feu, grimpent en circulant, au haut des cyprès; des colibris étincellent sur le jasmin des Florides, et des serpents oiseleurs sifflent suspendus aux dômes des bois, en s'y balançant comme des festons de lianes.

Chateaubriand a suffisamment justifié en invoquant l'autorité de Charlevoix "les ours ivres de raisins qui chancellent sur les branches des ormeaux." Je citerai cependant le témoignage du voyageur anglais Thomas Ansbury qui parlant de l'ours du Canada a écrit: "Il aime avec passion le raisin et, pour en avoir, il grimpe au sommet des arbres les plus élevés. Après qu'il s'en est nourri quelque temps sa chair devient délicieuse et continue de l'être jusqu' au printemps" (T. Ansbury, I, 166).

L'écureuil noir est bien connu, c'est le "*scurius niger*, très préjudiciable aux bleds de la campagne" (Casteby, II, 73).

L'oiseau moqueur ou "mocking bird" est le "*turdus minor* qu'Hernandès a raison d'appeler le roi de tous les oiseaux chantants, . . . son ramage est varié à l'infini. Il fait entrer dans la composition de ses airs les chants de tous les oiseaux" (*ibid.*, I, 27).

La colombe virginienne est la "ground dove, petite tourterelle tachetée . . . le poids de cet oiseau est d'une once et demie, et la grosseur celle d'une alouette. . . . Ils vivent dans la partie basse des pays vers la mer. Ces oiseaux volent en troupe, ils s'arrêtent souvent et se reposent ordinairement sur la terre" (*ibid.*, I, 26). Son nom scientifique d'après Coues est *columba passerina terrestris*.

Au nombre des productions de la Virginie qui pour lui s'étend jusqu'au Missouri, Jefferson indique les "scarlet strawberries" (*The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Washington 1903, II, 49-53).

"The native strawberry is found in these places in the greatest abundance," dit Imlay (p. 36); et il ajoute ailleurs: "Scarlet strawberries; *fragaria virginiana*; of an excellent flavor, and so plentiful, that from the beginning of April the savannahs appear quite red with them" (Imlay, p. 266).

Les perroquets verts à tête jaune sur les bords du Mississipi ont exercé la verve de plusieurs critiques. On les verra représentés dans l'ouvrage de Casteby. "Il a le devant de la tête couleur d'orange; le derrière de la tête et le col jaune, tout le reste de l'oiseau paraît verd," dit le vieux naturaliste (Casteby, I, 11). On s'est fort moqué de ces perroquets qui auraient fréquenté les bords du Mississipi. Au commencement du XIX^e siècle, on en trouvait cependant encore quelquefois aux environs de Cincinnati. Voir sur ce point Daniel Drake, *Notices concerning Cincinnati*, 1810, réimprimé dans les *Quarterly Publications of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio*, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 16. Imlay (p. 319) cite le *perroquet*, un animal qui ressemble en tout au *parrot*, mais plus petit, au nombre des animaux qui fréquentent les bords de l'Ohio. J'emprunte le passage suivant à Coues, j'espère qu'il paraîtra concluant:

L'opinion répandue que les perroquets sont des oiseaux des Tropiques est une grave erreur. Dans l'Amérique du Nord, le Perroquet de la Caroline, *Conurus Carolinensis*, au commencement du siècle, se trouvait en été jusque sur les rivages de l'Erié et de l'Ontario; dans les quarante dernières années, suivant des témoins dignes de foi, il remontait jusqu'à l'embouchure de l'Ohio, bien que maintenant son territoire soit très diminué et qu'il ne se trouve plus que près du golfe du Mexique (Coues, p. 617).

A la page même où Casteby donnait une gravure représentant le perroquet verd à tête jaune, s'en trouve une autre représentant le Cypres d'Amérique: "sa situation invite un grand nombre d'oiseaux à se loger sur ses branches pour y multiplier leur espèce" (Casteby, I, 11), notation dont Chateaubriand a fait immédiatement son profit comme on peut le voir par son texte.

Le cardinal ou *cardinalis* habite le sud-ouest des Etats-Unis et se trouve de façon permanente dans les Etats du Golfe. "Il fréquente les buissons, les lianes, les arbres bas et épais, les fourrés et se fait remarquer par son activité inlassable" (Casteby, I, 38; Coues, p. 455).

Casteby a représenté le *Picus niger maximus capite rubro* (I, 17-19); Carver a décrit le même oiseau, "qui," dit-il, "a le plumage noir par tout le corps excepté la tête et le cou qui sont rouges," et le traducteur français a ajouté en note: "c'est le Pic à domino rouge décrit par Edwards" (Carver, p. 360).

On pourrait opposer aux critiques de Mersenne bien des pages tirées des voyageurs français ou américains et qui confirmeraient l'impression de splendeur et de richesse luxuriante laissée par le tableau de Chateaubriand, je ne citerai que quelques lignes empruntées à Brackenridge qui visita le haut Mississipi en 1794 et qui en a tracé une description enthousiaste publiée seulement en 1834:

We gathered the wild pea vines and made ourselves soft beds under the shades of the trees, which stretched their giant vine-clad limbs over the stream. Flocks of screaming paroquets frequently lighted over our heads, and the humming birds attracted by the neighbouring honeysuckles came whizzing and buzzing around us (Brackenridge, p. 34).

II

Nous ne reviendrons pas ici sur la question si discutée du voyage de Chateaubriand en Amérique, nous réservant de le faire ailleurs et en détail. La seule conclusion que nous puissions tirer des rapprochements que nous venons d'indiquer c'est que le paysage du Mississipi a changé de façon considérable durant les premières années du XIX^e siècle. Si aux environs de 1830 on ne voyait plus ni hérons bleus, ni buffles, ni serpents verts, la faute en était uniquement à l'homme, devant qui la vie sauvage s'était retirée, et non à Chateaubriand. Le Mississipi qu'il prétend décrire n'est du reste pas le Mississipi de 1830, ni même celui de 1791, c'est "le Mississipi de La Salle et de Charlevoix," comme il l'a dit lui-même. Si donc nous voulons juger Chateaubriand selon les règles de la méthode historique, il nous faudra tout d'abord chercher à reconstituer le paysage depuis longtemps disparu. Si l'on se place à ce point de vue, et en bonne justice on doit le faire, bien des reproches adressés à Chateaubriand par des voyageurs venus longtemps après lui ou par des critiques mal informés, perdront toute valeur. L'auteur d'*Atala* a pu remanier d'autorité quelques textes, comme l'avait soupçonné Sainte-Beuve, il a pu transporter sur les bords du Mississipi quelques plantes comme le *pistia stratiotes* qui ne se voyaient qu'en Floride, il n'en reste pas

moins que, dans l'ensemble, sa documentation est aussi exacte que peuvent le souhaiter les plus exigeants. Il avait parfaitement le droit de répondre avec quelque hauteur dédaigneuse à l'abbé Morellet et au critique de la *Décade philosophique, politique et littéraire*; s'il avait voulu se justifier, il aurait pu le faire aisément.

Cet article était déjà sous presse quand on m'a signalé l'existence d'une édition d'*Atala* publiée par M. Timothy Cloran, professeur de langues romanes à l'Université d'Orégon (Jenkins, New York, 1911), et qui contient des notes érudites et nombreuses dont je regrette de n'avoir pu faire usage. M. Cloran a très soigneusement étudié la géographie du Prologue d'*Atala* en se servant de Charlevoix et de Carver, il cite Bartram comme l'autorité de Chateaubriand pour les *vignes sauvages*, les *coloquintes*, le *tulipier*, le *magnolia*, etc. Il a retrouvé chez Carver, p. 485, les *serpents-oiseleurs* que je n'avais rencontré ni chez Casteby, ni chez Bartram. Je tiens à signaler ici la priorité de M. Cloran et à attirer l'attention sur son travail qui vient confirmer cette étude sur plusieurs points.

GILBERT CHINARD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CORNEILLE AND THE ITALIAN DOCTRINAIRES

Writing thirty years after the event, Corneille asserts that he had never heard of the rules governing dramatic composition when he wrote his first play.¹ However, we find him citing Horace, and apparently from memory, in the preface of *Clitandre* published in 1632 (I, 261). Two years later in the preface of *La Veuve* he is evidently much concerned with the question of the unities and he promises: "Quelque jour je m'expliquerai davantage sur ces matières" (I, 378). In 1637, at the time when the Academy was at work upon its *Sentiments sur le Cid*, *La Suivante* was published. In its preface Corneille cites: le docte Scaliger. He declares: "j'aime à suivre les règles," and he hopes once more: "un jour traiter ces matières plus à fond" (II, 119). The quarrel of the *Cid* directed forcibly his attention to the doctrinaires² and marked a turning-point in his career as a dramatist. His letter to M. de Zuylichem states the matter very clearly. Corneille is speaking of the first volume of the 1648 edition of his works which contained the plays composed before the *Cid*: "Ce sont les péchés de ma jeunesse et les coups d'essai d'une muse de province qui se laissoit conduire aux lumières purement naturelles, et n'avoit pas encore fait réflexion qu'il y avoit un art de la tragédie" (X, 449 f.). While this statement should not perhaps be taken too literally, it is evident that Corneille, himself, divided his work into two parts, of which one was composed before, the other after he had taken up the study of the art of tragic composition.

Just how assiduously he studied this art which had been finally revealed to him must be largely a matter for conjecture, because his writings prior to the publication of the *Trois discours*³ (1660) contain but few indications. In the preface to *Héraclius* (1647) he cites the

¹ *Œuvres*, Paris, 1862, I, 137.

² See A. Gasté, *La Querelle du Cid*, Paris, 1898. *Lettre apologétique du Sieur Corneille contenant sa réponse aux Observations faites par le Sieur Scudéry sur le Cid*, pp. 147 ff.; and *La Preuve des passages alleguez dans les Observations sur le Cid* (Scudéry), pp. 219 ff.

³ "Discours de l'utilité et des parties du poëme dramatique"; "Discours de la tragédie"; "Discours des trois unités," *Œuvres*, Paris, 1862, I, 13 ff., 52 ff., 98 ff.

"Latin terms (*extra fabulam*) of the interpreters of Aristotle" (V, 146). The *Avertissement* of the 1648 edition of the *Cid* speaks of the different interpretations of Aristotle's text given by the philosophers (i.e., the commentators): "qui le tirent chacun à leur parti dans leurs opinions contraires" (III, 85), and in the same connection he makes a very clear allusion to a page of Robortelli: "un des plus doctes commentateurs de ce divin traité" (III, 86). In a letter of 1650 to M. de Zuylichem he claims to be speaking "le langage d'Aristote" (X, 454) and the *Épître* of Don Sanche, published the same year, cites a definition from the commentary of Averroes on Aristotle¹ along with a reference to Heinsius.

The studies which these statements suggest entered into the composition of Corneille's theoretical writings, the *Examens* and *Les trois Discours*, which were incorporated for the first time in the collective edition of his works published in 1660. He declares near the end of his first *Discours*: "Je tâche de suivre toujours le sentiment d'Aristote," and he cites the following commentators as auxiliaries in his quest for the real meaning of some of the statements contained in the *Ars Poetica*: Robortelli,² Vettori,³ Heinsius,⁴ Castelvetro,⁵ Beni,⁶ and Minturno.⁷ But he insists that these "interpreters" have often "explained" Aristotle and Horace "only as grammarians or philosophers" and he declares: "Le commentaire dont je m'y sers le plus est l'expérience du théâtre et les réflexions sur ce que j'ai vu y plaire ou déplaire" (I, 51). We shall not attempt to determine exactly to what extent these conflicting statements are to be taken literally. It would be merely a matter of patience to tabulate our reading notes and show that on all points, save possibly in the introduction of the love element in tragedy and a few minor details of doctrine and stagecraft, Corneille was in substantial conformity with

¹ Corneille was probably indebted for this bit of erudition to Robortelli, who quotes Averroes very frequently throughout his commentary.

² In *Librum de Arte Poetica Explicationes*, Florentiae, 1548.

³ In *primum Librum de Arte Poetarum Commentarii*, Florentiae, 1573.

⁴ *De Tragoediae Constitutione*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1611.

⁵ *La Poetica d'Aristotile, vulgarizzata e sposta*, Basilea, 1576.

⁶ In *Aristotelis Poeticam, Commentarii*, Padova, 1613.

⁷ *De Poeta*, Venetia, 1559.

There are also some passages which seem reminiscent of Piccolomini, *Annotationi nel Libro della Poetica*, Vinegia, 1575; Corneille seems to have had a special predilection for Robortelli, Castelvetro, and Minturno.

these authorities whom he treats so disdainfully. We shall limit ourselves to the consideration of those few cardinal or working principles to which were due Corneille's successes and failures as a dramatic poet.

Lanson considers Corneille "véritablement original et novateur" in his definition of the unity of action; for, while d'Aubignac had preceded him in the formulation of the rule, the poet had first exemplified it in his works.¹ This is Corneille's definition: "L'unité d'action consiste, dans la comédie, en l'unité d'intrigue, ou d'obstacle aux desseins des principaux acteurs, et en l'unité de péril dans la tragédie, soit que son héros y succombe, soit qu'il en sorte. Ce n'est pas que je prétende qu'on ne puisse admettre plusieurs périls dans l'une, et plusieurs intrigues ou obstacles dans l'autre, pourvu que de l'un on tombe nécessairement dans l'autre" (I, 98). And this is what Castelvetro has to say, after dilating upon the necessity of the tragic or comic action being one and complete, with a beginning, middle, and end, according to the consecrated formula: "Adunque è cosa manifesta che le solutioni delle favole deono avvenire per la favola stessa, cio è, che l'uscita dei pericoli, & che i cessamenti delle difficoltà sopravvenute nella favola deono avvenire per messo delle cose della favola, che di necessita, o di verisimilitudine seguitono dopo i pericoli, o le difficoltà" (p. 332).

The idea of the tragedy as a problem, as a product of literary art which strives to "exposer les moyens par lesquels le fait illustre, qui est le sujet tragique, est produit, à mettre sous les yeux du public le jeu de sentiments et de passions qui, concourant ou s'opposant, travaillent à retarder ou amener l'événement final," and which, according to Lanson (*loc. cit.*), "est, dans la technique du théâtre, la grande invention de Corneille, l'idée par laquelle il est le vrai fondateur du théâtre français," is all contained, at least in the germ, in this passage of Vettori: "Qui mores optime in personis exprimere scierit, aliosque post alios pro eorum natura, ex verisimile effingere, facile inveniet solutionem fabulae, tota enim pendet ex personarum moribus; vitabitque erratum, in quo saepe veteres poetae inciderunt, qui per machinam inducentes Deos Deasque, *solvunt* fabulam atque exodum, quae ultima est tragoediae pars, conficiunt. Nam *solutio*

¹ Corneille ("Les grands écrivains français"), Paris, 1898, p. 65.

fabulae, est ipsa exodus seu exitus fabulae; exitus vero debet deduci ex praecedentibus moribus, non quibusvis, sed qui magis accommodati ad *solvendam* fabulam videbantur" (p. 176).

Equally characteristic is Corneille's interpretation (not often followed in his practice), of the rule of twenty-four hours: "La représentation dure deux heures et ressembleroit parfaitement si l'action qu'elle représente ne demandoit pas davantage pour sa réalité. Ainsi ne nous arrêtons point ni aux douze ni aux vingt-quatre heures; mais resserrons l'action du poëme dans la moindre durée possible, afin que sa représentation ressemble mieux et soit plus parfaite" (I, 113). "Voilà," says Lanson (*op. cit.*, p. 64), "le principe rigoureux: le portrait le plus vrai est celui qui est *grandeur nature*." Now Castelvetro says the same thing and in terms quite similar to those of both Corneille and Lanson: "Della grandezza della favola, che è sottoposta ai sensi . . . è da dire, che sia tanta, quanta sarebbe quella d'un caso fortunoso degno d'istoria, che avvenisse veramente, essendo di necessita, che corra tanto tempo in rappresentare questo caso della favola imaginato . . . quanto corse in simile caso, o correbbere, mentre veramente avvenne o avvenisse. Perche si puo dire, che la grandezza della favola, la quale è cosa artificiale, in quanto è sottoposta ai sensi, sia uguale alla grandezza della verita del caso fortunoso, & che ella tenga quel luogo, che tiene, pogniamo, la figura, quanto è d'uguale grandezza all' huomo vivo figurato" (p. 163).¹

The one thing which, according to Lanson (*op. cit.*, p. 71), reveals better than anything else "la nature originale" of French tragedy, and in which Corneille entered into conscious opposition to Aristotle, is his insistence that the highest type of tragic action is that action in which the parties involved know what they are doing, and will to do what they do (I, 63). While it must be conceded that Corneille formulated here with more force and precision than his predecessors, he did not lack for a precedent. Castelvetro, after a laborious analysis of the different types of plot and their relative merits, closes the series with this conclusion: "La favola volontaria . . . nella quale la mutatione dello stato si fa in alcuno di sua volonta . . . è piu à lodare che la necessaria" (p. 312).²

¹ About the same statement, except for the comparison with the life-size portrait, is found in Vettori, p. 79.

² That is, one in which the solution is brought about by external or involuntary causes.

Here are two or three points of a less general nature which may be taken as fairly typical. In discussing the *dénouement*, Corneille remarks: "Nous devons garder toutefois que ce consentement [i.e., solution of the plot in comedy] ne vienne pas par un simple changement de volonté, mais par un événement qui en fournisse l'occasion. Il n'y auroit grand artifice au dénouement d'une pièce, si, après l'avoir soutenue durant quatre actes sur l'autorité d'un père qui n'approuve pas les inclinations amoureuses de son fils ou de sa fille, il y consentiroit tout d'un coup au cinquième" (I, 27). The same idea is expressed in strikingly similar language by Vettori: "Recte autem concludit agnitiones factas a poeta arte carere: *nullum magnum artificium poetae requirit*, hoc aut illud ponere in ore alicujus personae, quod valeat ad efficiendum quod illi volunt" (p. 158). Corneille's definition of the *nécessaire*: "Je dis donc que le nécessaire, en ce qui regarde la poésie, n'est autre chose que le besoin du poète pour arriver à son but, ou pour y faire arriver ses acteurs" (I, 94), finds its parallel in Castelvetro's defense of Dante who had made Virgil descend to limbo during the war between Caesar and Pompey: a thing manifestly impossible, since Virgil was not dead at that time. However it serves in the formation of the plot and should therefore be accepted (p. 565).¹ In the following instance Corneille seems to have consulted Castelvetro without however taking advantage of all the latitude which his Italian forerunner would allow. At the close of his long discussion of the *vraisemblable* and the *nécessaire*, he seeks to formulate a principle regarding the extent to which a poet may go in the invention of surprising details. He arrives at the conclusion that the poet must not invent any which are more extraordinary than the historical details contained in the same poem. He adds that this is contrary to the opinion of those who believe that such improbable inventions are proper if one can find any parallel for them in history or mythology, even though one has to search for them outside of the subject being treated (I, 97). This must be a reference to the following passage of Castelvetro: "Egli è vero, che bisogna, accioche le cose avenevoli, & non avenute ancora sieno verisimili, & credibili, o che sieno simili a quelle, che sono avenute altra volta, o a quelle, che havevano minore verisimilitudine di dovere avenire, & non dimeno

¹ Castelvetro illustrates his point further by reference to some of the Greek tragedies; Corneille cites his own.

sono avvenute, o almeno che le parti d'esse, o le particelli sieno simili a quelli parti, o particelli, che sono avvenute in diversi accidenti a diverse persone" (p. 186).

Near the beginning of his first *Discours*, Corneille gives expression to the doctrine to which is due much of what is most characteristic in his work: "Les grands sujets qui remuent fortement les passions, et en opposent l'impétuosité aux lois du devoir ou aux tendresses du sang, doivent toujours aller au delà du vraisemblable" (I, 15). This was not only in accord with the poetic art of the ancients, as Lanson states (*op. cit.*, p. 67), but it is insisted upon by practically all the Italian doctrinaires; by Castelvetro, for example: "La compassione, & lo spavento sono richiesti alla tragedia. Ma l'una & l'altre cose ricevono accrescimento grandissimo, quando oltre alle predette qualita sono anchora maravigliose, percioche la maraviglia è il colmo dello spavento, & della compassione" (p. 232).¹ Corneille insisted that the poet must derive this improbable subject-matter from history because these "great subjects" "ne trouveroient aucune croyance parmi les auditeurs, s'ils n'étoient soutenus, ou par l'autorité de l'histoire qui persuade avec empire, ou par la préoccupation de l'opinion commune qui nous donne ces mêmes auditeurs déjà persuadés" (I, 15). Here, too, he could find ample confirmation and perhaps sources in the authorities whom he avowedly consulted: as, for example, in the following passage from Robortelli: "Necesse est igitur, ut sciant (spectatores) prius rem ita cecidisse; quod si fabula tragica actionem contineat, quae non acta sit, neque sit vera, sed ab ipso poeta fuerit afficta secundum verisimile, commovebit fortasse animos audientium, at minus certe, nam verisimilia si nos oblectant, oblectatio omnis inde provenit, quod in veris inesse ea scimus; & omnino quatenus verisimile veritatis est particeps vim habet movendi ac persuadendi. . . . Verisimilia nos movent quia fieri potuisse credimus ita rem accidisse. Vera nos movent quia scimus ita accidisse, id totum arripit a vero" (p. 93).²

Thus far Corneille may fairly be said to have been guided. Here are two important instances in which he may well have been misguided. The farther the poet proceeds in his career as a dramatist,

¹ Cf. Robortelli, p. 294; Minturno, pp. 121, 124; Vettori, p. 119.

² Cf. Castelvetro, pp. 188 f., 205, 212, 383; Vettori, p. 95.

the more one notes in him the tendency to "fix up" dramatic situations. In the *Examens* and *Préfaces* of his later plays, one comes more and more frequently upon passages like this, where, in speaking of *Rodogune* (1644), he admits that his predilection for this particular play is due to "les incidents surprenants et qui sont purement de mon invention, et n'avoient jamais été vus au théâtre" (IV, 421); or, in the *Préface* to *Othon* (1664), where he declares that he had, up to that time, produced no tragedy in which there was a greater display of his "invention" (VI, 571). Such statements recall very forcibly this precept given by Robortelli: "Si videatur (exodum) non posse deduci ex praecedentibus, ingeniosus, peritusque poeta debebit excogitare aliquid verisimile, quod cum iis, quae ante dicta sunt, sit conjunctum quasi pars ex quo deducat exodum seu solutionem fabulae, id vero sit multis modis" (p. 176). A still more conclusive bit of evidence that Corneille sought at least confirmation for his procedures, along this particular line, is to be found in the last sentence of the *Préface* to *Sertorius* (1662), where, seeking indulgence for a breach of verisimilitude, he asserts: "Vous n'en serez désavoué par Aristote, qui souffre qu'on mette quelquefois des choses sans raison sur le théâtre, quand il y a apparence qu'elles seront bien reçues, et qu'on a lieu d'espérer que ces avantages que le poëme en tirera pourront mériter cette grâce" (VI, 363). Corneille's editor, Marty-Laveaux, notes with some surprise that nothing in the *Ars Poetica* quite corresponds to this statement of the poet. But it does occur in Castelvetro, who, like Corneille, claims to have deduced it from Aristotle's treatise: "Ultimamente la predetta seconda, o quarta maniera d'impossibilita si puo fingere per lo poeta, con tutto che non sia informata di ragione, ne accompagnata da molti beni, ne ricoperta da ignoranza degna di scusa, quando opera il fine della poetica, cio è giova alla constitutione della favola" (p. 619).

The next and last point which we shall consider exerted a more and more important influence upon Corneille's dramatic production. Corneille at least implies that he is giving an original interpretation to Aristotle's precept regarding the average goodness required of tragic characters: "S'il m'est permis de dire mes conjectures sur ce qu'Aristote nous demande par là (la bonté des mœurs), je crois que c'est le caractère brillant et élevé d'une habitude vertueuse ou

criminelle, selon qu'elle est propre et convenable à la personne qu'on introduit" (I, 31 f.). Now Robortelli, whom, moreover, Corneille cites in this very connection (p. 33), had arrived at precisely the same interpretation: "Sed Aristotelis in tradendis praeceptionibus tragoediae actionis, personaeque deligendae, quae apta sit ad tragoediam, specimen capit a praestantissima actione & persona, quae sibi videtur aptissima" (p. 133); and again, after adducing numerous examples from the ancients: "Eodem modo censenda est apta ad tragoediam persona, quae fortitudine corporis sit praedita; sed summa iniquitate, & crudelitate insignis hujus personae exemplum non apposuit Aristotelis, *sed a nobis facile potest proferri*" (p. 219). Castelvetro held the same view: "Io non posso comprendere, come la persona di santissima vita, trapassando da felicità a miseria, non generi spavento, & compassione, & molto maggiori anchora, che non fa la (persona) mezzana."¹ After dilating upon this idea, Castelvetro applies the same line of reasoning to vicious characters and then concludes for both classes: "Si che puo non meno il trapassamento del malvagio da miseria a felicità generare spavento & compassione, che il trapassamento del giusto da felicità a miseria" (p. 279).

It will be remembered that after the *Cid* (end of 1636) Corneille produced nothing until the end of the dramatic season of 1640-41. Then he came forward with two plays which, in spite of their greatness as tragedies, may be regarded as experiments; one, *Cinna*, a conspiracy tragedy, ending in the exit of the hero from peril by means of a reconciliation, without bloodshed or catastrophe; the other, *Horace*, ending in the exit from peril of the hero by means of the killing in duel of his friends and brothers followed by the murder of his sister. These two plays were followed (1642 or 1643) by *Polyeucte* in which the tragic situation is quite as extraordinary as that of *Horace*, and whose hero presents the type of a flawless character. According to a familiar tradition, Corneille, before risking his tragedy on the stage, read it at the Hôtel de Rambouillet, whose guests objected to the sanctity of the hero. In spite of their adverse comment the play succeeded. While we have no proof at hand, it is reasonable to suppose that it was in the face of this criti-

¹ Corneille presents the same point of view in the *Examen of Polyeucte* (III, 479) where he cites in support Minturno, pp. 182 f.

cism and of this success that Corneille sought and found confirmation for his procedure in the passage of Minturno, which he cites in his *Examen*, written some seventeen years later. At any rate, from this time on, the trend toward the extraordinary, in character as well as in situation, becomes more and more strongly marked in his tragedies. It appears even to some extent in his very next play of the following year, *La Mort de Pompée*, in which two of the principal characters (César and Cornélie) showed traits so extreme as to draw down upon them the savage raillery of Racine in the preface of *Britannicus*,¹ which was published a few years later. Nor can it be entirely fortuitous that his next two dramatic works are comedies, *Le Menteur* and its sequel (*La Suite du Menteur*), in which the leading character is an embodiment of "l'habitude vicieuse de mentir." Corneille again seems to be experimenting, to be "trying out" in a less elevated form of dramatic composition, his idea of an extreme, vicious character before risking it in the tragedy. This impression is confirmed by the satisfaction which the poet seems to find in the fact that, although *La Suite du Menteur* had been "mieux écrite," it had not, nevertheless, pleased the public as well as had *Le Menteur*, and that the hero had lost, at the same time with his "bad habits," "almost all his graces" (IV, 280). In his next play, *Rodogune* (1644) he ventures, finally, to present a tragic heroine who is "tres-méchante" and who recoils before no crime to attain her ends. In his *Examen*, written some fifteen years later, he declares that to this play, among all those which he had hitherto composed, "j'aurois volontiers donné mon suffrage, si je n'avois craint de manquer de quelque sorte, au respect que je devois à ceux que je voyois pencher d'un autre côté" (IV, 420).

After his *Rodogune*, Corneille's predilection for extraordinary situations and extraordinary characters is very strongly marked, and after that play his productions begin to have less attraction for the public. It was, finally, this predilection that led directly to the failure of *Pertharite* and his first retirement from dramatic composition, as he himself confesses, with some bitterness: "Ce qui l'a fait avorter au théâtre a été l'événement extraordinaire qui me l'avoit fait choisir" (VI, 17).² To the same cause are due those other

¹ *Œuvres*, Paris, 1885, II, 254 f.

² And especially the extraordinarily virtuous character of the hero; see below.

characters of his final period of composition, which elicited the biting sarcasm of Racine (*loc. cit.*), who accused him of having "betrayed common sense" and of having "abandoned the natural to plunge into the extraordinary." This explains the long, sometimes broken, but always dropping, curve which leads from *Rodogune* (1644) to *Suréna* (1674), which was so complete a failure, that the poet had the heart to write only three sentences in his *Préface*, of which here are the two which bear upon our thesis: "Le sujet de cette tragédie est tiré de Plutarque et d'Appian Alexandrin. Ils disaient tous que Suréna étoit *le plus noble, le plus riche, le mieux fait et le plus vaillant des Parthes*" (VII, 460).

It is quite possible that Corneille discovered in the doctrines of these Italian theorists only what he had already observed in practice, although it hardly seems probable. We may at least accept Lanson's statement that he did "what he wanted to do" (*op. cit.*, p. 61); only we shall have to add that really he carried his independence too far. In doing this he sought confirmation in these Italian doctrinaires, who thereby exerted a greater influence upon him than is generally placed to their credit, or, if one prefers, to their discredit. But our findings do not conform to Lanson's other assertion that Corneille was "docile to the indications of the public" (*loc. cit.*) unless indeed it be limited to a relatively short period of his career, i.e., for a few years preceding and following the *Cid*. The discussion to which that play gave rise convinced him of the necessity of adopting certain rules and especially of concentrating his dramatic materials. Since he avowedly studied, during the period that followed, these Italian exponents of Aristotle (see above) whose doctrines or interpretations of doctrines we have confronted with his, he must have derived more or less assistance from them, although he may have become unconscious of it, at the time when he wrote his *Discours* and *Examens*. His great successes followed rapidly and his docility diminished accordingly.¹ He becomes more determined to proceed along the way most congenial to him and he gradually assumes the attitude that his audiences, like his stage heroes, shall be what they ought to be, instead of being what they are. He rails at them for having hissed the too perfect husband, Pertharite, on the ground that "les vertus de bon mari sont peu à la mode" (VI, 17).

¹ Note his preference for *Rodogune* in the passage cited above.

In the discomfitures, at first partial, and then complete, which came to him, it was only natural that he should turn again to the sources which had confirmed him in his successes:¹ they confirmed him now in his obedience to certain dramatic principles which led to his defeats. Hence, if the latter part of his work is relatively a failure, it is very largely because, lawyer-like, he sought justification for his methods in opinions and interpretations of the law emitted by these earlier doctrinaires, instead of letting himself be guided by that intercourse with the theater, the court, and the town, which shaped so happily the work of Molière, his friend, and of Racine, his victorious rival.

COLBERT SEARLES

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

¹ Notably for *Polyeucte*; see above.



"GUY OF WARWICK" AND THE SECOND "MYSTÈRE" OF
JEAN LOUVET

In an inedited and little-known manuscript (*Nouv. Acquis.* 481) in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, there is a curious collection of early sixteenth-century mystères which from a literary point of view, perhaps, merit the little attention they have received. The plays have, however, a genuine interest for the student of the early drama, or for one who cares about the later history of mediaeval romance. In general the material for either investigator has been made accessible by a Greifswald dissertation, *Untersuchungen über Jean Louvets 12 Mysterien zu Ehren von Notre Dame de Liesse*, 1900, by Wilhelm Lohmann. In this, Dr. Lohmann gave a résumé of each play and made some attempt to identify its sources. As he failed to identify the second play, and as it is of interest both for its primitive dramatic technique, which is more suggestive of the fourteenth than of the sixteenth century, and for its evidence as to the passing of a story from romance to exemplum, and from exemplum to drama, it has seemed worth while to consider the matter at more length.

In regard to the author little is known beyond the fact recorded in the manuscript that in 1541-49 he was "serjent à verge au Chastellet" and that his plays were produced in Paris from 1536 to 1550. Dr. Lohmann seems to have proved that Petit de Julleville¹ was wrong in denying the identity of the author of these mystères with the Jean Louvet "opérateur aux fleurs" who was in 1540 one of the "Entrepreneurs" of the *Actes des Apostres* given by the Parisian Confrérie de la Passion. Beyond this little or nothing is known. From the plays themselves, which are obviously written to appeal to an audience whose credulity was as great as its humor was rough, we may infer that their author was of distinctly bourgeois taste and character.

Knowledge of the confrérie for which Louvet wrote these mystères comes largely from the notices heading the individual plays.

¹ *Untersuchungen* (=L.), pp. 1-10. Cf. Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, II, 608. Lohmann's arguments are accepted by Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, III, 15. 181]

Other confréries in France were similarly dedicated to Notre Dame de Liesse,¹ but no evidence of any connection between them has so far been adduced. In Liesse, a small town northeast of Laon, was the famous miracle-working statue of the Virgin which inspired the formation of these confréries and the coming of countless pilgrims. The Paris confrérie with which Louvet was connected seems to have been small. The largest number of speaking parts in any of his plays is eighteen, and it is evident that by doubling the rôles a much smaller number of actors could handle the play. The incomplete list of names at the end of Play III seems to establish the fact that women belonged to the confrérie and that at least three of them took part in this particular play which was "faict et composé" in 1538. The plays were given annually; the dates for the most part are indicated in the manuscript. They were commonly acted in the hall of the confrérie. Play VIII has: "joué au siège de ladite confrarie en la salle de l'ostel—rue vielle Tixirranderie, 1543." As Dr. Lohmann points out, this was "in unmittelbarer Nähe des Hotel de Ville, ebenso wie die Chapelle du Saint Esprit in der die confrérie gegründet war" (cf. Plays IV and IX). The stage properties seem to have been of the simplest sort.²

As to the plays, Dr. Lohmann divides them into four groups: I, Solche Stücke die ernste romanartige Stoffe enthalten; II, Stücke die vermutlich humoristisch gefärbten Legenden ihre Entstehung verdanken; III, Stücke die Lokallegenden von durchweg ernstem Charakter nachgedichtet; IV, solche Stücke die frei erfunden zu sein scheinen." The second play Dr. Lohmann rightly classified as belonging to the first group but he was at a loss for a more specific identification: "Wie man aus der folgenden Inhaltsgabe entnehmen kann, finden sich in demselben Anklänge an die Sage von *Amis et*

¹ L., p. 95, quotes from a *Histoire de Notre Dame de Liesse*, Liesse (no date): "Paris avait autrefois une confrérie sous le nom de Notre Dame de L. Une grand nombre d'autres villes de France se sont également vouées à Notre Dame de L." The confrérie existed until the Revolution; it was re-established in 1793.

Another confrérie, similar to that for which Louvet wrote, was the one existing in Paris from 1229 to 1426 to which belonged the well-known repertoire of the *Cangé MS.*, ed. by G. Paris and U. Robert, *Soc. des anciens Textes fr.*, 1870. Still others were found in Paris, Amiens, Nantes, and Rouen; cf. E. Roy, *Études sur le Théâtre fr. du XIV et du XV siècle*, Paris, 1901, p. 10; E. K. Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, Oxford, 1903, Index, "Confrérie," "Puya."

² L., p. 10, gives a list of the few stage directions and the properties noted in the MS.

Amile, und vielleicht ist irgend ein auf ihr beruhender Roman die Quelle Louvets" (p. 36).

But there can be no doubt that the ultimate source of the second play is the romance of *Guy of Warwick*. The list of dramatis personae with "Guyon, chevalier d'Angleterre," and "Tirius, compagnon de Guyon," as its chief personages, is in itself sufficiently suggestive. In all the mediaeval versions of *Guy*, French,¹ English,² or even Irish,³ the romance tells the same story as the play: how Guy, the pilgrim-warrior, on his return from the Holy Land, fights a duel with the persecutor of his old comrade Tirius: how the opponents are separated for the night; how Guy, sleeping in the King's care, is thrown, bed and all, into the sea by the emissaries of his enemy; how he returns next day to accuse and conquer his would-be murderer. It is, of course, exactly the same story that is told in the French prose version of the romance printed at Paris in 1525 "par Anthoine Couteau pour Francoys Regnault, libraire."⁴ As Louvet's play is dated "Mistere pour l'an mil cinq cens trente sept," there could be no special objection to supposing that he might have used this particular edition were it not for certain dissimilarities and for the difficulty of understanding why he should choose this particular series of incidents out of the whole long-winded romance. The reason is clear only when we return to the direct source of the play, the *Guy* story as it is told in the *Gesta Romanorum*.⁵

¹ See J. A. Herbert, *Romania*, XXXV, 69-70; T. A. Jenkins, *Mod. Phil.*, VII, 593, for French MSS. They are for the most part inedited.

² The English versions are listed by A. Billings, *A Guide to English Metrical Romances*, New York, 1901, p. 31. Cf. Zupitza's edition, *Early English Text Society*, 1883-91 (Auch. MS st. 142; Calus 903).

³ F. Robinson, *Zeitschrift f. Celt. Philologie*, VI, 167-81 (1907).

⁴ The 1525 edition represents the same version of the *Guy* story as that in the British Museum, MS Royal 15 E VI, ff. 227-72, which was written about 1445. Cf. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, I, 488.

⁵ Ed. H. Oesterley, Berlin, 1872. In the majority of the continental Latin texts the story is given as chap. 172, "De Constantia fidelis anime." In W. Dick's "Die *Gesta Romanorum* nach der Innsbrucker Hds. vom Jahre 1342." *Erlanger Beiträge zu Eng. Phil.*, VII, 1890, it is chap. 194, "De duobus militibus Gidone et Tyrlo." It is variously numbered in the Anglo-Latin *Gesta*. In Herbert's *Cat. of Romances*, III, 209, 215, it is listed as chap. 70; on p. 219 as chap. 78; on p. 224 as chap. 69 (in these versions Guy is called Josias or Rosias); on p. 241 as chap. 72, etc. The connection of the *Gesta* with the romance was pointed out by Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, I, 286; by Tanner, *Die Sage von Guy von Warwick*, *Untersuchungen über ihr Alter u. ihre Geschichte*. Diss., Bonn,

The *Gesta* version is one of the stock examples for the critic of the way in which popular stories, often excerpts from the romances, were used as exempla in that amazing "moral" collection. In no case, perhaps, is the allegorical explanation tacked on to the end of the *Gesta* tales more naively ridiculous than that which explains Guy as Christ; Tirius as man in general; the King's daughter into whose care Guy was given as the Virgin Mary; the seven sons of the villain as the Seven Deadly Sins; and the fisherman who rescued Guy as the Holy Ghost! Difficult as it is to understand the ancient popularity of such poor stuff as this and many others of the *Gesta*'s moralized tales, the fact of that popularity is not to be questioned, nor the influence which it exerted. It would be futile to number all the editions of the *Gesta* which were printed even in the one city of Paris in the early sixteenth century, but one may note in passing that the British Museum alone has at least ten Paris editions dating from 1499 to 1531.¹ Any one of these might have come into Louvet's hands, and that he used the *Gesta* version of *Guy* is shown by the following evidence.

The *Gesta* abbreviates Guy's famous history in startling fashion. A page or so does for his early life, marriage, and conversion—a matter of several thousand lines in the Middle English romance; five pages describe his meeting with Tirius and his fight with Tirius' enemy; two pages do for his return to England and death. The emphasis of the *Gesta* version falls on exactly those incidents which reappear in the play and amply explains its choice of material. In the *Gesta* and the play the story is localized in the eastern kingdom of Dacia and in the city of Constantinople; in the romance in the city of Spires, the present capital of the Rhine Palatinate, Bavaria. The latter version motivates the attack of the villain on Tirius by

1877, p. 39; by Oosterley and Herbert, *op. cit.*; by Swan, translator of the *Gesta*, re-ed. by Baker, London, 1905, p. 354.

The fact that the story of Guy and Tirius was of sufficient interest to be singly translated is shown by the fifteenth-century German prose text published by P. Mau (Jena, 1909), under the title *Gydo und Thyrsus, Ein deutscher Ausläufer des altfranzösisch-mittelenglischen Freundschaftsromans "Guy von Warwick."* This translation follows the Latin versions of the *Gesta* tale. It omits the moral.

¹ J. Graesse, *Gesta Romanorum*, Leipzig, 1905, pp. 306-18, lists some of the early editions printed in France, Germany, etc. He notes the French translations printed in Paris in the years 1525-29. It is probable that Louvet used the French and not the Latin texts.

making him desirous of revenge on the friend of the man who had killed his uncle; in the other two versions it is through jealousy of the honors heaped on Tirius by the King. In the play and the *Gesta* the villain's name is Pleb(e)us or Phebus; in the romances he is called Besart or Berard. Small as are these differences, the fact that *Gesta* and the play are alike in having them shows their relationship.

In comparing the two related versions it is seen that they differ chiefly in omissions which are clearly due to the need for dramatic condensation. Louvet omits the meeting of Guy and Tirius when the former returns from his pilgrimage. Guy sees his friend approaching the gallows and so learns his situation. In the *Gesta*, as in the romance, he meets Tirius wandering about in misery outside the city and learns his story from his own lips. The *Gesta* has the fantastic and dramatically impossible dream episode by which Tirius is led to investigate a cave in which he finds the sword destined to give Guy victory over his opponent. The play also omits from the fights between Guy and Phebus, the incident belonging originally to Guy's fight with the Saracen giant Amoraunt, of Guy's courtesy in allowing his opponent to drink and refresh himself, a favor which Phebus later refused to Guy. Possibly this knightly scene would have been beyond the appreciation of Louvet's practical, bourgeois audience. Out of regard for the number of his actors, he undoubtedly reduced the sons of Phebus from seven to two. He introduced, however, these few subordinate characters, a mariner, heathen "mamelukes," the executioner, etc., but for such parts not more than two actors would have been required. The one important addition to the *Gesta* story which is made in the play is the scene of divine intervention which Louvet had necessarily to introduce. It was this which gave justification to the play, just as the tag-end moral justified the highly romantic exemplum. Through omitting the rescue of Guy by the fisherman and substituting the Virgin as the familiar and pleasant *dea ex machina* who gave help so freely to her faithful servants, Louvet simply continued a dramatic tradition long since established.¹

¹ Cf. *Les Miracles de Notre Dame* (Cangé MS), ed. Paris et Robert, and Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, I, 120 ff. Lohmann compares the *Miracles* with Louvet's belated *Mystères*, pp. 24 ff.

In estimating the interest of the play it is obvious after reading a very few pages that its poetic merit is negligible. The language is dull and uninspired and occasionally burdened with strained rhetoric. In structure it is more successful. It has more unity of action than might be expected. Except for the lapse of time between the scenes in which Guy is supposed to have journeyed to the Holy Land, fought many battles, and returned to Constantinople, the action of the play is singularly quick. After Guy returns, he fights his battle for Tirius in the late afternoon, his attempted assassination takes place that night, and he achieves victory over his enemy the next morning.

The simple methods used by the confrérie in staging its plays are evident from the fact that a gallows, a bed, and an exit which could be used as a window seem to have been the only necessary accessories for this play which has almost no stage directions. It is difficult to conjecture any division into scenes, although Dr. Lohmann does attempt it, and lists twenty-three scenes with seven "Mansions" or changes of scene.¹ But the supposition is needless and improbable. Up to the attempted murder scene, where specific allusion to the bed and window fix the scene as an interior, there is no necessity for supposing that the stage was conceived as other than a field which served first as a meeting-place for Guy and Tirius in England, then as the field before Constantinople where the action of the play, with the exception of this one scene, can be supposed to have taken place.

A word may be added as to the history of the *Guy* legend in drama. So far as the writer has been able to discover, Louvet's play is the first extant dramatization in England or France of any portion of the romance. In England, where the story had been so long and so widely known,² there may well have been earlier versions, but the first allusion to a play on the subject is that by John Taylor, the

¹ L., p. xi: "Ich habe mit Hülfe der vorhandenen Bühnenanweisungen u. nach dem was aus den Texten der Stücke zu entnehmen ist, mir, die meiner Meinung nach, notwendigen 'Mansions' zusammengestellt. 1, Schloss Guyons (Schloss des Tirius?); 2, Paradies; 3, Konstantinople, Mauer; 4, Palast des Kaisers, Constantinople; 5, Palast des Phebus; 6, Palast des Sultans; 7, Wohnung des Henkers."

² The Anglo-French MSS date from the thirteenth century; most of the Middle English ones from the fourteenth. An instance of the popularity of the romance in the fifteenth century is found in the version made by John Lydgate (cf. F. Robinson, *Harvard Studies*, V, 194). Cf. "Guy of Warwick, Chap books and Broad-sides," *Harvard Bibliographical Contributions*, No. 56 (1905).

Water Poet. In his *Pennilesse Pilgrimage*, 1618,¹ he records: "At Islington . . . we had a play of the life and death of Guy of Warwicke played by the Right Honourable the Earle of Darbie his men."² This play was evidently more inclusive than Louvet's *Mystère* and must have belonged in type, not to the *Miracles*, but to the "heroical" plays which for a time afforded so much joy to those Elizabethan playgoers satirized in the *Knight of the Burning Pestle*.³ A play similarly entitled was entered on the Stationer's Registers "for J. Trundle, 1620, Jan. 19," as by John Day and Thomas Dekker. Another play on *Guy* was printed in 1661.⁴

LAURA A. HIBBARD

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

¹ F. S. Fleay, *Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, I, 136.

² This item seems to have escaped J. T. Murray who writes in *Eng. Dramatic Companies*, New York, 1910, I, 293: "As nothing is heard of an Earl of Derby's company after 1617, William Stanley's players probably disbanded about this time."

³ Ed. by H. S. Murch, *Yale Diss.*, New York, 1908. Dr. Murch gives a thorough-going account of the early dramatized romances, the attitude of the common people toward them, and the derision in which the old romances were held by the more cultured classes.

⁴ Fleay, I, 736; II, 370; Ward, *Eng. Dramatic Literature*, II, 592.

ON THE TEXT OF "LA BATAILLE DES VII ARTS"

Dr. Paetow's is the sixth (and the most elaborate) edition¹ of this deservedly celebrated poem, four² having been put forth by Jubinal (1838-39, 1875) and a much better one in 1880 by A. Héron, for the Société rouennaise de Bibliophiles. Jubinal dealt with the poem merely as an appendix to his edition of Rustebuef, defender of the University of Paris against the Mendicants; Héron's interest was primarily that of the local antiquary (for Andeli is supposed to be Les Andelys, on the Seine, 23 kilometers northeast of Evreux), and Dr. Paetow, whose dissertation, *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities*, 1910, is favorably known, approaches the work of Henri d'Andeli from the side of the history of pedagogy. Thus it happens that very little serious work has been done upon the text itself since G. Paris reviewed Héron's edition, in 1882; on this score, the editor's chief service is to have provided admirable facsimiles of the two Paris manuscripts.

Dr. Paetow aimed also to furnish "a faithful, line for line, prose reproduction [that is, English translation] of the contents of the original." His French text, however, appears to be based upon a somewhat capricious and wholly subjective choice of readings; no doubt the editor is aware that it deserves the name of "the original" only by courtesy. Thanks are expressed to Professors Weeks, Hamilton, and Beck for their assistance and Professor Weeks is thanked a second time "for much valuable help in editing and translating the poem." We imagine, however, that none of these scholars reviewed the text or the translation in its entirety, for there is cause for a good deal of dissatisfaction on the linguistic side, some of the errors made being of a kind easily avoidable by stricter attention to

¹ *The Battle of the Seven Arts*. A French poem by Henri d'Andeli, Trouvère of the Thirteenth Century, edited and translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Louis John Paetow. Memoirs of the University of California, Vol. IV, No. 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1914.

² The editor has overlooked the first edition of 1838, a copy of which is in the University of Chicago Library: *La Bataille et le Mariage des VII Arts, pièces inédites du xiii^e siècle en langue romane publiées pour la première fois par Achille Jubinal. Paris chez Edouard Pannier. Cette publication n'a été tirée qu'à un très-petit nombre d'exemplaires.* [MODERN PHILOLOGY, July, 1915] 60 [188

Old French grammar and phraseology. In what follows I have attempted not to criticize the French text in detail but to remove some of the "dreary and obscure reaches of the poem" of which the editor complains, my conviction being that it is not too much to hope that some future editor may be able to eliminate them entirely, and so justify a better opinion of this witty and extremely interesting satire.

14-15 are obscured by the division in two of the word *porvers* (the rhyme *VERSUS: VERUM* being impossible here) so that we should translate: "But they [the clerks of Orleans] in turn also talk wickedly, in that they call Dialectics rubbish."¹ 26 As the editor says, *Donaet* is, strictly speaking, the *Ars minor*. The form is interesting because the fall of the intervocalic consonant shows that the compound *Donatitus* (or *-etus*?) dates from at least the tenth or eleventh century. 38 I imagine the author is here speaking of a pepper-sauce thickened with burnt bread, with which curious material the salmon and dace were daubed upon the shield. 46 O. Fr. *ire* is "chagrin," "vexation" rather than "wrath." 55 *levent* has no support; *troussèrent* of B is good, especially as *troi seuent* of A could easily have been corrupted from it. 63 The battle took place in the shadow of Montlhéry, on the plain: why then render *soz* by "on"? 77 *Distrent* is mistranslated: it was these church Fathers who took pains to warn Divinity that she should avoid the emptiness and squabbles of the Rhetoricians, and this she proceeds to do. 97-98 I render: "The arts students and the grammarians all are now acting exactly contrary to the customs of the good old times." 107 Raoul de la Charité came perhaps from the town of that name on the Loire.

109-10 are mistranslated, *nul* requiring *ne* to make a negation. Rather: "All these [bold surgeons] would gather to the money-making if they saw there [in the coming battle] any prospect of illnesses [or wounds]." 112 I suspect the correct reading was *Cirurgie* . . . *Se seoit lez un sanglent tastre*, that is, "beside a trestle," or "butcher's block," the humble ancestor of the operating-table.

¹ *Porvers* is Lat. *PERVERSUS*. Elsewhere, it is true, Henri uses (*gent*) *perverse* (l. 93) which is the biblical phrase, but the form *porvers* is also well attested, e.g., *Richeut* 568 (*Romanic Review*, IV, 280, 296). The idiom reoccurs *Pel. Charlem.* 716: *il dist que curteis*, and often elsewhere. For *quiquelique* I adopt the explanation offered in *Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott*, I, 79.

170 The reading of A, *entre .ii. os*, "between the armies," is excellent; that of B, *entre irois*, is plainly a corruption and unintelligible. The editor adopts *irois*, but then translates quite unaccountably, "between the combatants." 210 *Propertius* in the translation is a slip for *Prosper*.

244 *hoschier* in B should not have been overlooked; as it has more point, it should have been preferred to *hochier*. 265 Rather: "For she could not be expected to resist everybody at once." 279 *nes* is misdivided: *ne les* is satisfactory for meaning. 311-12 I understand differently. The ladies went into Montlhéry (as they had been advised to do) and did this, not through fear of the enemy (which they never would admit); no, they went in "merely because of the love which they were [graciously] willing to bestow upon the castle." The dames really were afraid, but for the world would not admit it. And the irony continues:

Et de ce firent els savoir
Qu'els aiment les choses hautaines,
Et Gramaire aime les fontaines.

The editor does not help us on the last of these lines. Evidently Dame Grammar loves things not lofty, but what are these disreputable weaknesses of hers? According to Larousse,¹ *fontaine* also meant *grand vase d'orfèvrerie qu'on plaçait au moyen âge au milieu de la table et qui contenait du vin, de l'ypocras et d'autres liqueurs*. To Villon, *boire ypcras à jour et à nuitée* was the very acme of the indulgent life, and it may well be that these *fontaines* are connected with the *granz gomers* mentioned at the beginning (l. 10). I might observe, however, that both Du Cange and La Curne register the expression *faire ses fontaines*, c.à.d., *se livrer aux divertissements de la mi-carême*.² The day of *Laetare, Jerusalem*, it appears, was called *le Dimanche des fontaines*: *on se rendait à une fontaine pour boire des eaux*. The happy character of the service at mid-Lent is otherwise well known. In the service for the day occurs the word *sitiens*, signifying the person who may desire to join the church at Easter: could this be the needed link between the idea of rejoicing (*gaudete in laetitia*) and the custom

¹ I am indebted to Dr. C. J. Cipriani for noting this. It ought not to be difficult to verify Larousse's statement.

² Cf. also Chesnel, *Dictionnaire des superstitions populaires*, s.v. "fontaines."

of a picnic in the woods, with a draught from the spring? However this may be, *faire ses fontaines* meant undoubtedly "to have a festive time": *pour eulx esbatre et faire leurs fontaines* says one text. It may well be that while Logic claimed to love lofty things, Grammar was scorned as being content with frivolous amusements. Henri himself, in a passage (254 ff.) of which much more might have been made, for it shows the author very plainly in the rôle of an outsider in the quarrel, speaks of the *vanités* of the Grammar party.

325 *En l'essil ou il [Ovide] fu du moins*: "in the exile to which Ovid was relegated," rather than "where he was in want." The expression *estre du moins* had various meanings, and it is not easy to be certain of one's translation here, or at ll. 20, 120; but some help might be drawn from Tobler's note, *Li Proverbe au Vilain*, p. 142.

334-36:

Estacez Achilleïdos
Menoit par devant soi les hez:

"The word *hez* is somewhat troublesome," says the editor, but the reading of B, *les ez*, might have put him upon the right track. All the combatants introduced in this passage, beginning with the leader Estacet, have the diminutive termination *-et*—Chatonet, Avionet, Panflet, and Theaudelet: so these were not the "vets" but the junior contingent, the *cadets*, and they followed their leader with such ardor and nimbleness (346 ff.) that they came very near capturing Dames Logic, Astronomy, and Rhetoric by the feet;¹ but the ladies were lodged too high (in the tower of Montlhéry) to be caught. Cf. 416. 355 *encressent* is a variant of *engressent*, hence: "they stir up their pupils with their whips and their tongues." 357 *lasses* could never mean "tiresome." 358-59 Possibly the original read:

Logique fiert tant es siuanz
Qu'ele a mis sa cotele a panz.

362, 363 are two co-ordinate propositions: "With her arms she makes a great pretense, [but] on her body there is no substance," which fits the satire perfectly. 391 "Than there are disputes in Logic."

¹ Dr. Paetow's acceptance of Héron's suggestion (*les hez*, "the stakes") in 336 seems to lead him into the bizarre translation of *parmi les pies* by "among the stakes." Perhaps he has *pieux* in mind for this second passage, but one would have to go far afield among the dialects for such a variant as *piez* for *pieux*. Besides, both his MSS usually have *s* for *z*, and not *z* for *s*.

392 "Was unable to get thru successfully." 404 Here is mentioned a Walter the Englishman, *qui lut sur Petit Pont*, *lut* being, I suppose, pf. 3 of *lire*. The editor in both his translation and his note seems to refer it to *lutter* (!). But Dame Grammar here raises her voice to protest that ps. 3 of *lutter* in O.F. was necessarily *luite*—two syllables, hence impossible here. 427 ff. are badly mixed in the translation, and possibly not satisfactory in the MSS. In 427, *rabaces* is almost certainly modern *rabâches*, which appears to be a Picard form; cf. *Aussi ne fait il fors rabaches*, in Adam's *Ju de la Feuillie* (*Anc. Théâtre frç.*, p. 72), while *rabasser* is noted by Bescherelle as "a former variant" of *rabâcher*. 445 "Have no longer any use for their [hospitable] quarters" (which Versifex used to occupy). 450 ff. are the concluding reflections of Henri d'Andeli: some of these I understand quite differently from the editor. In Brittany and in Germany, it appears, you may still study Grammar, but not in the neighborhood of Paris nor in Lombardy. "Sirs, the people of this world come and go in streaks: after good wheat will come oats (an inferior grain); for as much as thirty years they will act thus, until a new generation will come on the scene who will go back to Grammar, just as they used to do when Henri d'Andeli was born, who comes forward to say in Grammar's name [*de par li*] that the smart pupil who cannot construe his lesson should be destroyed."

Cognitio duplex, said Erasmus: *verborum prior, rerum potior*.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

